Vol. XXXV. JULY, 1958 No. 3

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. Cunningham, V.G., Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 181

Warning of Holy Office on changes in the Liturgy—Admonition of Holy Office on delay of Baptism—Decree of S.C. of Sacraments on report of confirmations—Blessing of a radio station—Letter on cultivation of Latin language.

THE EXPRESS: NEW ISSUE (1884-87) AND THE NATION (1887-90): The last of J. G. O'Connor's Catholic Newspapers ..... Robert A. Daly, M.Sc.Agr. 190

THE JEWISH ENIGMA IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS ..... Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 202

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 212

Blessing of oil for Extreme Unction—The Morality of Gambling.

CANON LAW ..... Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 227

Simulation and the Canonical Irregularity of the abuse of Sacred Orders.

LITURGY ..... Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 234

Omission of Leonine Prayers—English Hymns at the beginning and end of Mass—Admonition from the Holy Office on unauthorised changes in the Liturgy.

HOMILETICS ..... Rev. Bede Heather, S.T.L., L.S.S. 245

The Son of God among men.

NOTES 250

Mary McKillop: A New Biography (Right Rev. Mgr. J. J. McGovern)—The Ferry (Very Rev. T. Veech).

BOOK REVIEWS 261

The Life of St. Louis (Joinville); Love One Another (Colin); Lunacy and Letters (Chesterton); The Soul of the Apostolate (Chautard); The Apostolic Constitution "Christus Dominus" (Ruddy); The Provincial Council of Manila of 1771 (Bantigue); Elizabethan Quintet (Meadows); Our Lady of Lourdes (Deery); The Beda Book; Mary McKillop (Thorpe) [p. 250].

SHORT NOTICES 244, 260

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

10a die Junii, 1958.

Official Documents

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

A.A.S., 50, p. 114.

I

WARNING

It has been reported to this Supreme Sacred Congregation that some undue attempts are being made to bring changes into the Liturgy. Certain persons are doing this under the pretext of bringing back the ancient Liturgy, or of helping the faithful towards increased participation in the divine offices. Books have even been published, in which new or obsolete orations or prayers and readings from the Divine Scriptures are inserted into the liturgical functions or even into the Mass. Some excisions are also made from the same offices.

Consequently, this Supreme Congregation, with the approval of the Sovereign Pontiff, addresses itself to the local Ordinaries, who have the right and the duty of vigilance with regard to the exact observance of the rules of the sacred canons concerning divine worship (can. 1261 § 1), admonishing them not to allow new rites or ceremonies, nor readings or prayers, without consultation of the Apostolic See, to be introduced into the divine offices, and not to allow anything to be cut out.

The Ordinaries should also warn the clergy, both secular and regular, that it belongs to the Apostolic See alone to approve liturgical books and new litanies for public recital (can. 1257 and canon 1259 § 2); that, similarly, prayers and exercises of piety cannot be allowed in churches or oratories without the revision and express permission of the Ordinary. In more difficult cases, the Ordinary is bound to submit the whole matter to the Apostolic See.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, February 14, 1958.

ARTHUR DE JORIO, *Notary.*

II

ADMONITION

The custom has obtained in some places of delaying baptism for fictitious reasons of convenience or liturgical pretext. Such

delay or postponement may be backed up by certain opinions regarding the eternal lot of infants who die without baptism—opinions that have no solid foundation.

Hence this Supreme Sacred Congregation, with the approval of the Sovereign Pontiff, warns the faithful that infants should be baptized as soon as possible, according to the ruling of Canon 770. The Congregation exhorts Parish Priests and Preachers to urge the fulfilment of this obligation.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, February 18, 1958.

ARTHUR DE JORIO, *Notary.*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

Decree

Report on Confirmation no longer required.

(A.A.S., 49, p. 943.)

It was prescribed in the Decree *Spiritus Sancti munera* (n. 9) concerning "the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation to those who, through serious illness are in danger of death" (14 September, 1946), that local Ordinaries were bound to send a report to this Sacred Congregation on the number of those confirmed and on the way followed by the extraordinary ministers of the respective diocese in the acquittal of this great office.

After ten years have elapsed, since the issue of that Decree, the Congregation, with the consent of His Holiness, decides that from the end of 1957, and thereafter in perpetuum, the Ordinaries are not obliged to send the aforesaid Report. The reason is that from the reports received during the ten years, it is sufficiently certain that the Sacrament of Confirmation was properly conferred, and diligently, according to the requirements of the Decree.

The Ordinaries must continue, however, to see that, in their dioceses, the extraordinary ministers of this Sacrament give every attention and care to its administration, being on the watch lest Confirmation be exposed to the danger of nullity, or subject in any way to irreverence.

Should any abuse creep in, let them, in view of the immediate suppression thereof, have recourse to this Congregation.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the same S. Congregation, July 1, 1957.

✠ B. CARD. ALOISI MASELLA, *Prefect.*
F. BRACCI, *Secretary.*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

Blessing of a Radio Station

(A.A.S., 49, p. 1043.)

Clerus, vel a proximiori Ecclesia, vel ab aliquo alio loco ad hoc parato, procedit usque ad stationem radiophonicam, canendo vel recitando:

Canticum Zachariae (*Luc.* 1, 68-79).

Benedictus Dominus, Deus Israel . . .

vel Canticum trium puerorum (*Dan.* 3, 57-88 *et* 56).

Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino . . .

Ibi Sacerdos delegatus intonat Antiphonam: In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum, et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum.

Postea dicitur Psalmus 18:

Caeli, enarrant gloriam Dei: et opus manuum eius annuntiat firmamentum.

Dies diei effundit verbum: et nox nocti tradit notitiam.

Non est verbum et non sunt sermones: quorum vox non percipiatur.

In omnem terram exit sonus eorum: et usque ad fines orbis eloquia eorum.

Ibi posuit soli tabernaculum suum, qui procedit ut sponsus de thalamo suo: exultat ut gigas percurrens viam.

A termino caeli fit egressus eius, et circuitus eius usque ad terminum caeli: nec quidquam subtrahitur ardori eius.

Lex Domini perfecta, recreans animam: praescriptum Domini firmum, instituens rudem;

praecepta Domini recta, delectantia cor: mandatum Domini mundum, illustrans oculos;

timor Domini purus, permanens in aeternum: judicia Domini vera, justa omnia simul,

desiderabilia super aurum et obryzum multum: et dulciora melle et liquore favi.

Etsi servus tuus attendit illis: in iis custodiendis sedulus est valde.

Errata tamen quis animadvertit?—a mihi occultis munda me.
A superbia quoque prohibe servum tuum: ne dominetur in me.
Tunc integer ero et mundus: a delicto grandi.
Accepta sint eloquia oris mei et meditatio cordis mei: coram te, Domine, Petra mea et Redemptor meus.

Gloria Patri, etc.

Et repetitur Antiphona:

In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum, et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum.

Deinde Sacerdos dicit:

V. Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.
R. Qui fecit caelum et terram.
V. Dominus vobiscum.
R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Oremus. *Oratio.*

Deus, qui dispositione mirabili omnia in mensura et numero et pondere constituisti, atque ad detegendas et subjiciendas quas in rerum universitate indidisti vires, hominem tuae mentis participem effecisti, dignare, quaesumus, has machinas earumdemque operas ad vocales undas, per aethera diffusilem fulgurantis lucis ictu quocumque transmittendas, bene✠dicere, ut afferant in discrimine salutem, in aerumnis solatium, in dubiis consilium, in tenebris lucem, atque ita tui nominis gloria latius innotescat in orbe, et populi cuncti tuo consocientur amore. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

R. Amen.

Oremus. *Oratio.*

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui per Verbum tuum mundum condidisti, atque in Eodem incarnato et passo omnia instaurare decrevisti, concede propitius: ut per Ipsum vocalibus undis omni creaturae praedicatum, intercedente Beata semper Virgine Dei Genitrice Maria, et Sancto Gabriele Archangelo, caelestis mysterii nuntio, gentes omnes in unum coeant Christi corpus, et pacis munere fruantur. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum.

R. Amen.

Et aspergit stationem radiophonicam aqua benedicta.

Finita Benedictione cantatur vel recitatur Hymnus:

Te Deum laudamus, *cum* V. Benedicamus, *et Oratione:* Deus cuius misericordiae, etc.

URBIS ET ORBIS

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, vigore peculiarium facultatum sibi a Sanctissimo Domino nostro Pio Divina Providentia Papa XII tributarum, formulam benedictionis stationis radiophonicae, prout in adiecto prostat exemplari, adprobavit, eamque in Rituali Romano inserendam mandavit. Contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Die 24 Octobris anno 1957.

C. CARD. CICOGNANI, *Praefectus.*

H. DANTE, *Substitutus.*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITIES

A.A.S., 50, p. 292.

Letter

to their Lordships the local Ordinaries on the due cultivation of the Latin language.

Throughout the centuries it has been a rightful part of the Church's educational policy that candidates for the sanctuary should cultivate the Latin language and love it. We do not, of course, suppose your Lordship to be unaware—since you have the education of youth destined for the ecclesiastical state in the ambit of your chief interests—how much the Church insists, by directive and precept, that those who are studying for the priesthood should be diligently imbued with a knowledge of human literature generally, and especially with requisite skill in the Latin language. Latin is, indeed, in a very true and proper sense, the sacerdotal language, the language which the priest is bound to use when he carries out sacred offices as the vicegerent of Christ before God. There can be no conceivable doubt, therefore, that the priest, for the sake of his very office, should not only be well acquainted with the Latin language, but should have acquired all possible skill in it.

Unfortunately, it has become a common opinion in our time that ecclesiastics are falling far short of the erudition and culture, which gained for our predecessors of former days the esteem of everybody. It has even come to this, that often, and in not a few places, we hear it said of recently ordained priests that their ignorance of Latin is so great that they are quite unable to speak

Latin fluently or write it grammatically, and cannot as much as understand an easy Latin author.

The cause of this is not far to seek. It will easily be discovered by anyone who considers how our ecclesiastical students are at present being trained. We must acknowledge that even in our Seminaries the study of Latin has diminished very much. The schools that lead boys to higher ecclesiastical studies have, in many cases, lost that distinguished reputation for thorough studies, which once gave them standing and authority as houses where literary culture and the love of everything good and virtuous were happily combined. Alas! our age is considerably responsible for this decline, for it seems to esteem and desire comfort and utilities in a way that involves real contempt for a life which laboriously seeks the accomplishments that hold the polish of art and literature and are redolent of beauty.

Lest anyone should think that we are going beyond the limits of truth, when we complain of this decline of Latin in our Seminaries, it will suffice to cite some examples known to this Congregation. Apostolic Visitators who recently made searching inquiries into studies in the Seminaries of various nations, have furnished information in this matter which is saddening indeed. Really, the deterioration seemed so bad, that not a few, moved by the growing state of decline, spontaneously turned our mind to a matter of such importance. The persons here mentioned are men whom their office and dignity make competent and reliable witnesses: Rectors of Universities, Presidents and Professors of Seminaries and even some laymen of outstanding authority and zeal for the good of the Church.

But what has moved us most is the intervention of many Bishops who at great length and almost in the same terms warn of the harm which the Church will certainly incur, unless opportune and efficacious remedies are applied. Those Bishops, who have complained of the sad lot of the Latin tongue, deplore ignorance of it especially for a very grave reason. Ignorance of Latin, in fact, leads to a lowering of standards in philosophy and theology. Students who are weak in Latin will study these subjects less, or will study them superficially. For, unless the seminarists know the Latin language really well—the Bishops are rightly emphatic on this point—the writings of the Holy Fathers, the definitions and edicts of the Councils, the documents of the Roman Pontiffs, the views of the Theologians, in a word,

the great monuments of all ecclesiastical Tradition will be sealed to them.

Hence, this Sacred Congregation is paying unhesitating attention to those appeals, which are numerous and weighty, and have come from all parts. In the first place the Congregation trusts that it will do something useful and acceptable by gathering into a small book some documents regarding the present matter given by the Supreme Pontiffs nearest to our own time. Whoever scrutinizes this little volume will easily see with what abundance and strength of arguments the diligent and careful learning of Latin is urged for our young men. It is the Popes that speak, and, consequently, all should see what, through their voice, the Church orders, and with prompt willingness act accordingly.[1]

For the fuller realization of our purpose, it is useful to set forth the remedies to be used for curing the evil. These are few in number but very efficacious.

I. There is no doubt whatever that the best means for restoring Latin to its older flourishing and vigorous condition is a careful selection of Teachers. It is clear that no progress can be hoped for in this branch of study as long as incompetent teachers are assigned to this work. The Apostolic Visitators affirm with one voice that the bad results are chiefly referable to the fact that masters are appointed who are unequal to the task. The Ordinaries should therefore see that the students are

---

[1]In view of furnishing their Lordships the Bishops with abundant arguments on behalf of the study and use of Latin, the Sacred Congregation of Universities and Seminaries has sent them two opuscula entitled: I. *Summorum Pontificum cum de humanioribus litteris tum praesertim de Latina Lingua documenta praecipua;* II. *Il Latino lingua viva della Chiesa.* In these booklets competent men set forth the matter learnedly and clearly.

Of papal documents the following are given: Pius IX, Encyclical *Singulari quidem,* March 17, 1856 (*Enchiridion Clericorum,* n. 338)—Leo XIII, Letter *Plane quidem,* May 20, 1885, (*Ench. Cler.,* nn. 461-465); Encyclical, *Depuis le jour,* September 8, 1899 (*Ench. Cler.,* nn. 593-596); Pius X, Letter of S. C. of Studies, *Vehementer sane,* July 1, 1908 (*Ench. Cler.,* nn. 820-822); Letter, *Sollicitis nobis,* December 8, 1910 (*Ench. Cler.,* n. 849); Letter, *Votre lettre,* July 10, 1912 (*Ench. Cler.,* n. 861)—Benedict XV, Letter S. C. of Seminaries and Universities, *Vixdum Sacra Congregatio,* October 9, 1921 (*Ench. Cler.,* n. 1125)—Pius XI. Ap. Letter, *Officorum omnium,* August 1, 1922 (*Ench. Cler.,* n. 1154); Ap. Letter, *Unigenitus Dei Filius,* March 19, 1924 (*Ench. Cler.,* n. 1189); M. P., *Latinarum litterarum,* October 20, 1924 (*Ench. Cler.,* nn. 1200-1202)—Pius XII, Encyclical *Mediator Dei,* November 20, 1947 (A.A.S. 39 [1947] 544s); Address, *Magis quam,* September 23, 1951 (A.A.S. 43 [1951] 737); Address, *C'est une grande joie,* September 5, 1957 (A.A.S. 49 [1957] 845-849).

entrusted to learned praeceptors only, and especially to those who have studied more deeply and diligently in the literary courses of Universities and are skilled as teachers. If such are not to hand, they should be prepared with all earnestness.

II. In order that Latin may be more easily and more thoroughly learned, the seminarists must be instructed from the threshold of their literary studies in the rudiments of this language. It is necessary to choose and follow a right method of teaching, such as suits novices who are being led to cultivate Latin, to love it and to learn it as a labour of love.

Some follow the severe way, according to which, too much time and labour is given to philological investigations, and the minds of the students are filled with very learned and almost infinite disquisitions. What wonder if the students show no love but rather dislike for such learned lumber?

Others, on the contrary, like to indulge in some more recent ways of teaching, and think that the students, having received a few rules on speaking and writing, should proceed as soon as possible to the reading of the best Latin authors. But what happens is that the learners, not having mastered the necessary rudiments, are prevented by all manner of difficulties from rightly understanding what they read. Hence it is frequently brought about that boys grow weary of their vain and fruitless attempts, lose courage, and despair of ever learning Latin.

As anything that exceeds set purpose and due measure is always harmful, we ought to keep a middle course. The right and effective way will be that which—while proper attention is given to the rules of grammar and to the construction of sentences—leads gradually by frequent exercises to the overcoming of difficulties and the right understanding of the authors that are read.

And what authors should be selected? We should not merely content ourselves with the writers of Roman Antiquity only. Authors from the whole field of Latinity should be duly appreciated—authors, namely, who by the purity of their style and their aptness of phrase, as also by their good diction, come close to the masters of the golden age. Indeed, Latin speech never fell so low as not to have found some splendid adepts conspicuous for elegance of style as well as good doctrine. The young Latinists should be stimulated by specimens taken from literary

men of all ages. Thus they will learn to know that Latin has never become a dead, bloodless language, covered by the dust of centuries, and useless for the culture of real life; it is rather an instrument and a vehicle of the wisdom and humanity by which, under the leadership and tuition of the Church, our civilization has been formed. Latin, therefore retains its firm force and effectiveness even at the present day.

III. In the last place, we must greatly commend generosity with regard to facilities of learning. To know Latin grammatically and practically, much time and labour are required, for the difficulties are considerable. We cannot, therefore approve those curricula of study (unfortunately obtaining in some Seminaries) which assign only a few hours to instruction in the Latin language. Some plead the excuse that they have to surrender to necessity: they say that, if they do not follow the curriculum prescribed by the civil authorities, the students cannot acquire academic degrees which are publicly recognized. That excuse cannot be accepted. In the education of its levites, the Church, in accordance with its own end and field of action, uses its own laws—laws which it cannot abstain from following. Besides, it is well known, that there are Seminaries in which young men do learn Latin and, at the same time, take academic degrees.

In communicating to your Lordship these remarks on the study of Latin, we wish to emphasise their importance and their authoritative weight. They deserve your Lordship's utmost care and solicitude. We are quite confident that in your Seminary everything will be arranged in accordance with these rules and exhortations.

In this hope, we wish you everything that is good and best, and greet you cordially in the Lord.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of St. Callistus, the 27th day of the month of October, in the Feast of Christ the King, 1957.

✠ J. CARD. PIZZARDO, *Prefect.*

✠ C. CONFALONIERI, *Secretary.*

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

The Express and The Nation

The Express: New Issue (1884-87) *and The Nation* (1887-90): The Last of J. G. O'Connor's Catholic Newspapers.

Consideration has been given in earlier articles[1] to the origins and styles of two Catholic weekly journals which were published in Sydney during the years 1877-84. These were: *The Catholic Times,* commenced by Joseph Graham O'Connor in March of 1877 and continued by him until the close of 1879, and *The Express,* which took over from the *Times,* and was published under the direction of a group of clergy and laymen with Archbishop Vaughan as chairman. Both papers necessarily came into some competition with the *Freeman's Journal* (1850-1942), but that was not their primary object.

In its first four years, at least, *The Express* held high rank amongst its contemporaries for the excellence of news presentation, editorial treatment and tone. Yet, as has happened frequently with journals of its class, it began to slip once the direct influence of its originators was diminished.[2] Finance, undoubtedly, was a problem, but the death of Dr. Vaughan in August of 1883 seems to have provided the decisive blow.

By August of 1884 the paper had passed into the hands of O'Connor, and his two partners of that time, Cyril Weale and John McCrory.[3] With that change came also a number of changes in policy and a new publication, *The Express: New Issue,* replaced the old issue as from September 6.[4] Its appearance almost coincided with the arrival of Dr. Moran, as the new Archbishop landed in Sydney two days later.

Opinions varied as to the merits of the change. Both the *Newcastle Morning Herald* and the *Yass Courier* thought that there had been a decided improvement, while the Bathurst *Record*—a Catholic paper with which *The Express* had clashed sometimes—hoped that it had eventually got into good hands.

---

[1] *Australasian Catholic Record,* Vol. 34 (1957), 112-122 and 202-213.

[2] *Vide,* the comment of a Victorian subscriber (*The Express, n. i.,* September 20, 1884): ". . . (Previously) delighted to find that we Catholics had in Australasia *one* journal which devoted a fair portion of its columns to . . . *purely Catholic* literature and intelligence, I . . . became a constant subscriber. During the past nine months I have noticed with regret a considerable falling-off of such desirable matter. . . ."

[3] McCrory was editor from the latter part of 1882.

[4] The old issue was an eight-page broadsheet; the new was 24-28 pages, "neatly stitched in elegant outside leaves of the true national colour—bright emerald green. . . ."!

The most pointed, and most humorous, comment, however, came from *The Bulletin*, whose writers had the happy knack of hitting the tender spots. It noted that:[5]

> "*The Distress* is coming out at 6d, with a coloured cover, and a portrait of Dr. Moran in spectacles. As J. G. O'Connor is in it, and as everything is to be 'treated from an independent standpoint,' we have no doubt that all the wholesome fun displayed in the *Catholic Times* (dead), *Sydney Punch* (deceased), and other brilliantly successful papers with which J.G. has been connected will be reproduced in the forthcoming series of *The Distress*.
>
> "We look forward with great interest to Mr. J. G. O'Connor's 'new departure,' and we shall cherish it with much love and devotion—while it lasts!"

And that was a fair prediction, as the New Issue, launched in a period of drought and minor depression, was not to enjoy any large success, though a circulation of 24,000 per month (6000 per week?) was claimed for it.[6] By May of 1885, Weale and McCrory had sold out their interests, leaving O'Connor to carry on alone. Yet he could not have been disheartened by the prospects, as, a year later, he announced a further venture in the form of a Catholic evening daily paper, which was to be known as *The Nation*.[7] A successful Catholic daily paper was high amongst O'Connor's fondest hopes.

But, again, finances were lacking and when *The Nation* did appear eventually in January of 1887 it was a weekly and not a daily. With its initiation *The Express*: *New Issue* became the *Illustrated Express*[8] and both it and *The Nation* were published separately until June 29, 1887. *The Nation* ("with which is incorporated *The Express*") was carried on from that point until March 27, 1890.[9]

Published by the same person and to much the same purpose, *The Express*: *New Issue* and *The Nation* had much in common. Compared with their two predecessors, both followed a line that was more 'Irish'; and 'Irish-Australian Catholic' might, therefore, be more accurately descriptive of them than merely 'Catholic.'

The adoption of such an attitude had its main basis in the Australian experience over the visit of the Redmond brothers, John and William, in 1883. At the same time it is well to remember that from 1884 onwards the Archdiocese of Sydney,

---

[5]*The Express, n. i.*, September 27, 1884.
[6]*Ibid.*, August 27, 1885.
[7]*Ibid.*, May 13, 1886.
[8]First issue, December 23, 1886.
[9]During 1887 it was a four-page broadsheet, selling at 1d; after January 6, 1888, it was eight pages for 3d.

for the first time in its existence, was enjoying the rule of one who was a native of Ireland, and who was soon to have distinction added to his office by being created a Cardinal.

The reaction to the Redmonds' visit was quite remarkable. Their mission had the patently moderate motives of placing before Irishmen here the program of the Irish National League and of collecting funds for its operations, yet they were greeted wherever they moved by a vicious campaign of misrepresentation that was sponsored and abetted by hostile sections of the press. John Redmond afterwards wrote:

> "When I arrived in Sydney, the Phoenix Park murders were the talk of the Colony. I received a chilling reception. All the reputable people who had promised support kept away. The priests would not help, except the Jesuits, who were friendly to me as an old Clongowes boy. A leading citizen who had promised to take the chair at my first meeting would not come. Sir Henry Parkes . . . proposed that I should be expelled from the Colony but the motion was defeated. The Irish working men stood by me, and, in fact, saved the situation. They kept me going until a telegram arrived exculpating the Parliamentary Party. Then all the Irish gradually came around and ultimately flocked to my meetings."[10]

It has been suggested that the Irish delegates had been sent to Australia at O'Connor's suggestion; at any rate, through all their early troubles there was no firmer supporter of their cause than he was. It was O'Connor who chaired their first meeting in Sydney, which was held in the Academy of Music for want of a better hall;[11] it was he who was the first president of the Irish National League in New South Wales, and a vice-president of the League's Australian Federal Council, that was set up at the conclusion of the Redmonds' tour. Perhaps his attitude may be explained best by a statement he made at a social gathering when the next group of Irish delegates—John Dillon, John Deasy and Sir Thomas Grattan Esmonde—were in Sydney in 1889. Dillon had presented him with a gold watch and chain from "some Irish friends for patriotic services from boyhood to the present day," and in acknowledging it O'Connor remarked that:

> "What he had done in the past was the outcome of patriotic sentiments instilled into him by good Irish parents. His forefathers in the past had suffered and bled for the old land, and he would be recreant indeed if he did not follow their example. Each beat of the watch would remind him that the time was drawing nigher and nigher when his country would take her proper place amongst the nations of the earth. . . . The chain would remind him of how many links he was bound to the old land . . . and the little sovereign

---

[10] *Vide*, "Irish Envoys in Australia," copy of a lecture by B. J. McGrath to the Australian Catholic Historical Society, Sydney (June 5, 1956), p. 3.

[11] *The Express*, February 24, 1883.

purse would ever be . . . at the service of such a fund as that for which the delegates came to Australia."[12]

No wonder, then, that O'Connor's papers adopted a strong Irish Nationalist tone. Because it was reckoned that the greater number of colonial journals were bitterly opposed to the claims of Irish patriotism, regarded them with contemptuous indifference, or shrunk from their advocacy and vindication, *The Express, n. i.*, was to give "Irish questions from an Irish point of view,"[13] while *The Nation* was to do that, and, as well, to "advocate the claims and maintain the rights of the Irish-Australian Catholic minority of New South Wales."[14] Obviously, there was no doubt in O'Connor's mind that Catholic faith and Irish nationality were inseparably connected, though he was less vehement in advancing that claim than, for instance, Tighe Ryan was in a later Catholic paper, *The Catholic Press* (1895-1942).

By reading *The Express, n. i.*, and *The Nation,* therefore, a partial view may be obtained of the Irish situation, and the course adopted was largely one of 'follow the leaders in Ireland' in being pro-Parnell, the Parliamentary Party and Home Rule. This course, interesting to relate, went so far as to include the attitudes towards the Papal Rescript of 1888, dealing with the Plan of Campaign, boycotting, and intimidation,[15] which, to put it mildly, was not well-received in Ireland. At a special National League Convention held in Sydney the delegates agreed in "solemnly protesting[16] against the action of His Holiness . . . in interfering in Irish politics, and rejoicing at the respectful but firm attitude of the Irish leaders and masses in refusing to allow the Papal Rescript to, in any way, interfere with organisations having for their objects National and political rights . . .". Brasher elements at the Convention, if anything, went a little further. One delegate, by way of example, suggested that Michael Davitt's "services to humanity were incalculably greater than any Cardinal's," and another felt that "the Italian Cardinals knew no more of Irish affairs than the Irish knew of Italian affairs, and that was very little."[17] Not unexpectedly, the Vicar-General, in

---

[12]*The Nation,* October 31, 1889.
[13]*The Express, n. i.,* September 6, 1884.
[14]*Ibid.,* May 27, 1886.
[15]Monsignor Persico visited Ireland to view the situation in 1887 and the Rescript was issued after he returned to Rome.
[16]A majority of delegates thought "do regret" to be too mild an expression.
[17]*The Nation,* June 22, 1888.

the absence of the Archbishop, took the first opportunity to deliver suitable admonitions from the pulpit of St. Mary's.[18]

The general Catholic situation at the time that Archbishop Moran took over the See of Sydney was not one that *The Express, n. i.,* felt happy about. Addressing itself to a lengthy editorial on his "battleground" it found many things crying for reform.[19]

> ". . . Politically," it said, "society here is rotten and Catholics stand worse in New South Wales than in any other British dominion. They number two-sevenths of the people, an unlucky proportion, too small or too large for peace. . . . Here, since that unhappy 12th of March 1868 . . . Orange lodges have multiplied themselves in a congenial soil and politics have been based on anti-Catholicism. Our unwise lay leaders have accepted the false position: no great public issue has been raised such as in every other Australian colony pits poor against rich in serried unsectarian parties; and while Catholics leave it so here Orangemen and baseminded political chiefs ask nothing better than the easy occupation of kicking a minority and insulting and robbing the Church.
>
> "Another crisis impends. Dr. Barry, arriving free from colonial pettiness and admiring Dr. Vaughan's labours for religion in education, asked Catholics to assist him in obtaining religion in Public schools. Some of his scheme's details proved objectionable, no doubt, but conference with him was not tried.
>
> "Snubbed by Catholics . . . and attacked by Secularists and suspected by Protestants for too much civility to us . . . what wonder if he be led now to seek his end by using colonial bigotry? Dr. Barry's scheme now stands recommended by the hostility of the Catholic Church. . . .
>
> ". . . In religious work (Dr. Moran's) zeal will find ample field. . . . In country parts the sparseness of population, and in Sydney the old evil heaven of half-heartedness, which is but now dying out and which Dr. Vaughan's inspiring heroism did much to kill, have, in spite of the labours of many zealous, holy priests, left the Catholics . . . still lacking in the full spirit of faith and devotion. . . . What he may not see is how little has been done here to convert non-Catholics. Perhaps it is the outcome of English cruelties in Ireland and of Orange bigotries here, but certainly, Protestants are generally held by Catholics here as all sons of perdition, necessarily bad in faith. . . . Their prejudices have been embittered recklessly and their feelings turned against the Church by, for instance, Catholics' union with Secularists in anti-Sabbatarian movements and their political championship of the liquor traffic.
>
> "In social matters Dr. Moran will see much to grieve him. No longer, because a disproportionate number of Irishmen, untaught in trades, seek the career of a publican, shall we see our people impoverished, degraded, and embruted by drink to a degree far beyond other peoples. No longer, from a foolish opposition to Orange temperance agitators will the Church of Christ pose as the friend and ally of drink. This alone will be a great change. Irishmen seek the land, situations under government . . . and hotel life. The access to the land will, in a year or so, be cut off by the

---

[18] *Ibid.*, July 6, 1888.
[19] *The Express, n. i.*, September 6, 1884.

new Land Bill, and only town life will be left to our people, where intoxicating liquor is their direst foe. . . ."

In some respects this statement is more critical than fair, but it does open for discussion certain aspects of policy that were features of the papers. For one, the Stuart-Farnell amendments to the Land Acts were never liked, and a ready support was given to the Land and Industrial Alliance which aimed at further reform.[20] For another, a Temperance Column was a regular feature. The "drink" situation, admittedly, was bad, and the Bishops found occasion to refer to it specifically in the Pastoral Letter of the Plenary Council of 1885, and expressed their opinion that alcohol had a worse effect on the Irish-Catholic than on anyone else. That same Letter also commented upon the lack of skills amongst Catholic working men which caused them to be "abundant in the police force, in the navvy camps, in the labour gangs of large contractors, in the charge of public houses, on the wharves and on the cab stands, dam making or fencing in the far interior, or timber getting by the fever-stricken estuaries along the northern coast. . . ."[21]

The reference to Dr. Barry requires some detailed explanation. Alfred Barry, succeeding Frederic Barker in 1884 as Anglican Bishop of Sydney, was puzzled by the Public Instruction Act of 1880. Holding "almost orthodox" views on primary education,[22] it was his opinion that "education without religion is like the year without a Spring,"[23] and, soon after his installation, he intimated his intention to strive to obtain religious instruction for Anglican children in the public schools.[24]

A meeting of leading clergymen of differing Protestant sects, convened by Dr. Barry, agreed with his ideas in principle. *The Express* also supported the move for Protestant religious instruction in public schools on the basis that it was better for students to be Protestant in religious thought than to be atheistic or agnostic; the scheme, if successful, might also act as the thin end of the wedge in eventually getting Government aid for Catholic schools. The paper, therefore, favoured the idea of a conference with Dr. Barry. But the time at which this was

---

[20]*Ibid.*, November 1, 1884, and May 9, 1885.
[21]Cardinal Moran's "History of the Catholic Church in Australasia," pp. 687 and 691.
[22]*The Express*, April 5, 1884.
[23]*Ibid.*, April 12, 1884.
[24]*Ibid.* May 10, 1884.

suggested was inopportune as it would have been ill-advised for, say, the Administrator, Dr. Sheridan, to have come to some arrangement with Dr. Barry before Dr. Moran arrived in Sydney.

Later on, in 1884, Dr. Moran did call on Dr. Barry and informed him that he (Dr. Moran) "would most willingly follow him in any movement calculated to bring about the establishment of the principles of religion in public education."[25] But, by that time, Dr. Barry had changed from an attitude of apparent fixity of intention to one 'swinging to all points of the compass;'[26] he had become satisfied with the 'religious character' of the public schools.

As to why Dr. Barry had changed his attitude two possible reasons, amongst others, might be advanced. Firstly, his initial moves seem to have been made before he could have gauged adequately the Protestant-Catholic colonial climate with respect to education. And, secondly, there was a definite attitude amongst colonial Anglicans that they did not like their bishop to take a great deal of responsibility on his own initiative. Bishop Broughton had fought a losing battle for power of authority for the Anglican hierarchy during what Kenneth Cable describes as the "Crisis in the Church of England, 1848-1868"[27]; his successor Dr. Barker, acquiesced in the circumstance; Dr. Barry did not like it but was tied by what had transpired in earlier years. Canon (now Bishop) Loane, intimating as much, suggested that "he had quite an excessive opinion of his rights as bishop, and too easily overlooked the rights of his Synod."[28]

In glancing at Catholic affairs, as seen by *The Express, n. i.* and *The Nation,* one is impressed instantly by the rapid advances that were made during the first six years of Cardinal Moran's episcopate. Much was expected of him by the Catholic people and they were not disappointed.

As a churchman, the Cardinal's first impact was in ecclesiastical administration. Expansion necessitated revision and in the decisions of the Plenary Council of 1885 a more secure basis of organisation was set, not only for Sydney, but for Australasia generally. Under his guidance, and with a fruitful

---

[25]*The Nation,* August 12, 1887.
[26]*The Express, n. i.,* November 1, 1884.
[27]Lecture to Royal Australian Historical Society, Sydney, March 25, 1958 (in press).
[28]"A Centenary History of Moore Theological College" (Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1955), p. 61.

division of labour, Sydney came to be recognised as something of a model diocese. Henry Austin, an Englishman and a personal friend of the first two Archbishops, freely admitted in 1891 that he could not shut his eyes to the fact that the affairs of the diocese were never so ably administered as they were by the Cardinal.[29]

Concurrently, the growth in the numbers of religious institutions was little short of astounding. Both by migration and by local training, the force of priests, brothers and nuns was multiplied and its action increased in the performance of such works as befitted the various Orders. By 1888, foundations of Sacred Heart Fathers, Vincentians, and Passionists; Patrician and Christian Brothers; and five new Orders of nuns had been added, and at the beginning of 1889 the first students-in-training took up residence in St. Patrick's College at Manly. William Dalley, speaking in May of 1887, referred to 23 churches, 10 church-schools, 14 schools, 24 convents, 15 presbyteries, and 8 charitable institutions, within the diocese, that had been completed or commenced since September of 1884. St. Mary's Cathedral, too, had not been forgotten, and the continuation of work on its fabric was made the central theme for the Catholics' participation in the centennial celebrations of 1888.[30] And, incidentally, no body was more to the fore in those celebrations than the Catholic one was. Dr. Thornton, the Anglican Bishop of Ballarat, is reputed to have remarked about them: "You could see nothing wherever you turned but the purple of Roman Catholic Bishops and the flaming red robe of the Cardinal. The Roman Catholic element swamped everything else and the Cardinal was the head and front of the celebration from start to finish."[31]

New South Welsh politics in the period 1884-90 were, as *The Express, n. i.,* described them mid-way through 1886, "at an exceedingly loose end."[32] Ministries followed, one upon the other, in a rapid succession, and the enacting of constructive legislation was the exception rather than the order of the day. Squabbles and internal dissensions too frequently were at the core of ministerial defeats and the opposition forces, when offered the charge of government, were at a loss to provide anything better.

---

[29]*Freeman's Journal,* February 7, 1891.
[30]Moran, *loc. cit.,* p. 703.
[31]*Catholic Press,* September 23, 1909.
[32]May 20, 1886.

There were grounds, too, to complain of an unhealthy growth of bureaucracy in government departments, and scandals involving administration were 'proved' on a number of occasions.

O'Connor's papers, as ever,[33] were vehemently anti-Parkes. Parkes was looked upon as being anti-Irish and anti-Catholic—and expressedly so ever since the madman O'Farrell had taken a pot-shot at Prince Alfred, back in 1868—and, therefore, no real good could be expected of him. When he returned from England in 1884 *The Express, n. i.*, greeted him by calling him "the most successful charlatan and the hollowest fraud who ever hoodwinked a patient and suffering public."[34] When his "retirement" was announced a little later on, it warned that "the snake is none the less to be feared because in an apparent desire for rest it has coiled itself up;"[35] and when the Jennings administration assumed office in 1886, the paper was happy, at least on the score that "it bangs the door in Parkes' face and leaves him out in the cold to the consolations of his half-a-dozen Abigails and parasites."[36]

The adoption of such a position, naturally, created difficulties when it came to matters where O'Connor's and Parkes' opinions coincided, even though they may have been based on different premises. *The Express, n. i.*, being tinged with some anti-Imperialist, republican, and 'Australia first' symptoms, might well have been much more critical of the Soudan expedition had it not been that Parkes was one of that campaign's most open opponents and Dalley its virtual promoter.[37] Again, while it was agreed that the entry of the Chinese into the country should have been drastically curbed, *The Nation* did not like Parkes' Restriction Bill of 1888, because, of all things, his show of arrogance towards England and his antagonism of the Chinese![38] It was easier when it was a matter of Freetrade versus Protection, as Parkes was Freetrade, while O'Connor was always strongly Protectionist and "from the year 1863 up . . . never missed an opportunity of backing up (his) belief in the doctrine."[39]

---

[33]Parkes had been praised in the last issue of the old *Express* because it was thought that he might have taken up with the Barry case for the reinstatement of religion in public schools. The "mistake," once made, was not repeated.

[34]*The Express, n. i.*, September 20, 1884.

[35]*Ibid.*, November 8, 1884.

[36]*Ibid.*, February 25, 1886.

[37]*Ibid.*, February 21, 1885.

[38]*The Nation*, May 25, 1888.

[39]*Ibid.*, January 6, 1888. O'Connor aimed to publish another paper—*The Protectionist*—in the latter half of 1889.

Catholic politicians generally received a favourable treatment from O'Connor, but they were not freed from criticism. Dalley, "our most ornamental politician,"[40] was accorded due recognition for his good points, but that praise did not extend to what was called his Imperialist, "consummated in glory" policy. Louis F. Heydon, the son of convert Englishman, J. K. Heydon, was championed by *The Express, n. i.*, for his ideas on the Land Laws and on Payment of Members, but was criticised for 'English' tendencies: ". . . For an Australian, Mr. Heydon is a trifle too English. His democratic ideas are stiffened with a great deal of Conservatism; indeed, on some points he is almost a Jingo. For instance, he believes in Imperial as opposed to Australian Federation. . . ."[41] T. M. Slattery received what seems to have been more than his fair share of praise, but that could have been due to his being a brother-in-law of O'Connor twice-over.[42] Even John McElhone, the remarkable representative from Upper Hunter, who had received so much fiery criticism in the *Catholic Times*, was acknowledged as being "not too bad" and having some use as a stirrer-up of political mud.[43]

Sir Patrick Jennings, who became the first Catholic to hold the office of Premier in New South Wales,[44] received a consistent support from O'Connor. Jennings' rise in political stature had been watched with a keen interest. Admittedly, he was not a "political genius of the first order," but he was considered to be thoroughly safe and honourable. "As Colonial Secretary, playing second fiddle to Dibbs," it was reckoned that "he was conspicuously the wrong man in the wrong place, for the simple reason that that position afforded him no proper scope for the exercise of his conciliatory tact and bonhomie." As the Premier of a coalition administration, it was predicted that he would be "in his element."[45]

But it was not proved so, and Jennings' inadequacies for the existing situations soon became obvious. The country was looking for the vigorous action of a strong man,[46] but Jennings was more easy-going than that. "It makes me mad to see him so *still*. He

---

[40]*The Express, n. i.*, October 25, 1884.
[41]*Ibid.*, May 9, 1885.
[42]Slattery's first wife, Anne O'Connor, died in 1885. He married her sister, Agnes, in the following year.
[43]*The Express, n. i.*, October 1, 1885.
[44]Dalley had been "Acting" Premier when Stuart fell ill, 1884-5.
[45]*The Express, n. i.*, February 25, 1886.
[46]*Ibid.*, May 20, 1886.

reminds me somehow of the fat boy in Pickwick, of whom it was said: 'Damn that boy—he's gone to sleep again!" commented a columnist of *The Express, n. i.,* less than three months after Jennings had taken office.[47]

In fairness to Jennings, it should be explained that he was tested in the Assembly by most turbulent elements, both within and without his own following. The opposition, led on by Henry Parkes, acted most vigorously. The mooting of a policy of *ad valorem* duties "led to more scientific stonewalling than any which (had) been developed before an Australian parliament. . . . Scenes hardly excelled in Continental Legislatures were of nightly occurrence, and fights were frequent and free."[48] Jennings had had enough of that by the end of a year and resigned his commission. In the opinion of his biographer in *Australian Men of Mark*:[49] ". . . had he only been strong enough to refuse office, at a time when it required a man of greater experience than himself to control public affairs, his name would have been unobscured by the slight shadow that fell over it in 1886". Yet, the *Illustrated Express* still thought of Jennings as "one of our most promising public men"[50]—that is, "promising," even after almost 20 years of active political life!

So much for some of the distinguishing features of these papers of O'Connor. Compared with the earlier *Express* the standard of journalism was lower, and for lengthy periods their content was flat and dull, but that was some reflection of how O'Connor viewed the times.

The accumulation of an unsatisfactory financial position has been given as the immediate reason for the failure of the enterprises. When *The Express, n.i.,* was stopped £6000 was owed by about 1000 subscribers,[51] while the debit on *The Nation* had reached £1100 by March of 1890.[52] But, if a paper doesn't sell, there must be fundamental causes, and, in seeking these, one is forced to conclude that (a) *The Freeman's Journal* was preferred, and (b) most of the Catholics were, after all, not that keenly

---

[47]*Ibid.,* May 13, 1886.
[48]"Cyclopedia of New South Wales" (McCarron, Stewart and Co., Sydney, 1907), pp. 71-3.
[49](Maxwell. Sydney, 1888), Vol. II, p. 42.
[50]February 16, 1887.
[51]*The Nation,* July 6, 1887.
[52]*Ibid.,* March 27, 1890.

interested in Irish affairs as O'Connor, and others, would have liked them to have been. References are to be found, here and there, to an "*Express* party" and a "*Freeman's* clique" which were antagonistic to each other, and one fairly prominent Catholic once remarked—and others agreed with him—that "it was well known that the deplorable rivalry existing between the two Irish Catholic journals of the city was at the bottom of all their failures."[53] In another place it was suggested that the trouble lay with the "Irish-Australian jingoes" or the "Annual Irishmen," who would show up for St. Patrick's Day festivities and would claim their mother country only when it suits them . . . (and) take such a paper as *The Express,* which did good battle for poor Ireland, so long as they had not to contribute a penny for its support.[54]

R. A. DALY.

St. John's College, University of Sydney, Camperdown.

[53]*The Express, n. i.,* April 25, 1885.
[54]*The Nation,* July 22, 1887.

The Jewish Enigma In The Epistle To The Romans

The Epistle to the Romans, which deserves to be called the Queen of all letters ever written, has often found hospitality in the pages of the *A.C.R.* At present, in this year 1958, there is a special reason why St. Paul should speak to us again from that same Magna Charta of the Theology of Divine Grace. It is probably nineteen hundred years, last Spring (our Autumn), since the epistle was dictated to St. Paul's amanuensis, Tertius, at Corinth. It would have been in the month of March that it sped across the Mediterranean to Rome, carefully carried by the hands of St. Phoebe, Deaconess of the Church of Cenchrae. We can hardly doubt that the precious roll of papyrus did not often leave the folds of that devoted woman's "peplos"—the ample outer robe worn by Greek women—till she had delivered it to the Roman community. Yes, we are grateful to Phoebe for having been the carrier of the future of our thinking about the grace of God. She has a feast in the Roman Martyrology on September 3.

There is, indeed, some difference of opinion regarding the date of the Epistle. The beginning of 57 A.D. had the preference of the Catholic scholars Prat, Lebreton, and of the French Protestant Goguel; Father Lagrange considered that the Epistle may have been written in the winter of 56, but as the sea was closed during the winter months, it would not have gone to Rome before the beginning of March. The date for the official inauguration of the season of safe navigation was March 5. So Father Lagrange could be put in the company of the advocates of 57.

The arguments for the date A.D. 58 (patronised by Cardinal Ruffini, the Catholics Sickenberger, Bardenhewer, Gaechter, Boylan, and the Anglicans Sanday and Headlam) owe their strength to observations of the great archaeologist W. M. Ramsay. The position is briefly this.

The Epistle to the Romans was written shortly before the famous exit from Hellas and return journey to Jerusalem described in Act. 19:21 to 21:17. It seems we can date that

journey with great probability in the year 58, on the basis of Acts 20:6, 7.

St. Paul celebrated the days of the Azyms at Philippi, and the suggestion of the text is that, immediately these days were concluded, he started (with Luke) to rejoin his vanguard of five at Troas. With adverse winds the journey over from Neapolis took five days and the subsequent stay at Troas, lasting seven days, ended on Sunday, as the Acts tell us. In the year 58 the Pasch fell on Tuesday, March 28, and, if the journey from Philippi-Neapolis began on the following day, the 12 days mentioned by St. Luke would end on Sunday, April 9. Considering St. Luke's inclusive method of calculating time (Cfr. Lk. 9:28) this reconstruction of his Philippi-Troas diary seems to have serious probability. Hence we opt for celebrating the centenary of the Epistle to the Romans this year.

The pages we have chosen for presentation as a centenary reminder constitute the section that deals with the enigma of the Jewish people standing outside the regime of salvation established by their own Messias. They are poignant and weighty pages, which it would take a whole book to elucidate. It is only by making St. Paul himself give the elucidation in the form of a Targum or Paraphrase, running like a brief commentary —the ancient word "enarration" would seem to be the best term—that we can put such a considerable section into a few pages.

To avoid the unpleasantness of unusual typography, we shall follow the method of the Jewish Targumin and make no distinction between the Apostle's text and the paraphrastic additions. The text of the Epistle can be consulted, if the fidelity of the paraphrase is to be tested. We are simply supposing that St. Paul is giving us his dense thought in English in a more diffuse form—here and there in a modern anachronistic form.

The eight chapters which form the dogmatic part of Romans end in a lyric of "Redemption Triumphant." In that final stanza: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ . . ." St. Paul sings the grandeur of the gift which has mostly come to the gentiles. When he considers that the Jews as a people are out of it, we can imagine him telling Tertius: "We must take a day's silence on this tragic contrast."

When he takes up dictation once more, it would be with sentiments like these: "If such be the glories of the evangelical economy, what are we to say of the great misery of the Jewish people? I must, alas! write the story of that Jewish enigma." And he begins:

It is no feigned anguish that I am expressing. It is the plain truth from the lips of a disciple of Christ. I am speaking out of the union of my soul with Christ. My conscience bears me witness and the Holy Ghost concurs with that witness, for it is He that rules my life. My sorrow is immense, and my anguish is unceasing. I would wish to do anything, however impossible, on behalf of those brethren of mine. I would wish, if that could be so, to be anathema—to be separated from Christ for their sakes. They are my kinsfolk by blood, and their privileges are of the greatest. Yes, they are Israelites and to them belongs the adoption of sonship, to them belongs the glory of God Who dwelt amongst them in the Shekinah, to them belong the alliances or covenants concluded between God and the Patriarchs, to them belongs the legislation of Sinai, a code of divine laws, to them belongs the worship of God with all its divinely appointed liturgy, to them as depositaries of the Messianic revelation belong the promises, and from them—PRIVILEGE OF PRIVILEGES—Christ was born, He who is God, blessed for ever. Amen.

But no affliction of heart can prevent one from realising the sad truth of the present situation and vindicating the ways of God throughout it all. The fidelity of God has not been wanting. The oracles of His mouth have not fallen to the ground. Those oracles concerned Israel; but the true Israel of God is not simply identical with the historical Israel. Not all those descended from Israel, that is from Jacob the Patriarch, are true Israelites. Neither are all the carnal race of Abraham his spiritual children. Read the Scriptures and you will see how the divine choice works. "In Isaac," says the Almighty, "not in Ismael shall a seed be appointed to thee." That means that it is not the children of natural birth that constitute the SEED, but it is the children of promise that shall be counted Abraham's children. Remember the words of the promise: "This time twelve months I shall come, and Sara shall have a son." But you will say: "Sara's son was chosen rather than the son of another woman Agar." I will show you that the difference is not just that. The same elective

process of discrimination worked in the case of the children of *one* mother. Rebecca conceived twins at one conception from Isaac our father, and, when the children, Esau and Jacob, were not yet born, when as yet they had done nothing good or evil, the elective purpose of God, His permanent elective purpose, was shown. God's choice or election is not determined by works deserving a reward; it rests on God's gratuitous call. Hence it was said to Rebecca: "The greater shall serve the less."

In perfect harmony with this choice of His, God spoke centuries later through the Prophet Malachias: "Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated," which means, My love of choice has gone to Jacob, to Israel, namely, and not to his elder brother Esau who is Edom.

Well—let it be granted—it follows that God's fidelity to His promise remains inviolate, but is it not at the expense of His justice? Is such differentiation fair dealing? Are we then going to say: "God has fallen short of even-handed justice?" Heaven forbid! An absolutely free choice on the part of the sovereign God is quite compatible with His infinite justice. In the Scriptures God declares this sovereign freedom of His divine will, for He says to Moses: "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and pity on him whom I pity." Obviously, God can distribute His OWN gifts as He wills. It is He alone that can confer worthiness on him whom He calls worthy. He *makes* the justice of His own free giving. It is really not a matter of human willing nor of a man running, but a matter of God having mercy. He is also free in creating the situation in which a human heart hardens itself. God, speaking in the Scripture, says to Pharao: "For this very purpose I set thee on the throne of Egypt, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be celebrated throughout the whole world." The conclusion is: "God shows mercy to whom He wills and whom He wills He hardens." This means that He gives grace in smaller measure or gives grace to the indisposed, allowing that play of personal freedom, refusal, and disobedience, which results in obduration.

Well then, one might object, if all depends on God in this absolute way, should the sinner be blamed? God's will makes persons good or bad. Why, then, does God blame them? To such

an objector, a creature criticizing his Creator, I'll give the answer he deserves, an answer *ad verecundiam*. I'll say: "O man, who are you to call God to account? Do you know your condition or place? Shall the piece of pottery say to the potter: why did you make me like this? Has not the potter, who moulds the clay, full liberty to make out of the same lump whatever he wishes: a splendid vessel or a mean vessel? Now, if God, wishing to show His wrath and display His power bore with great patience vessels of wrath fashioned for destruction, and if, in order to make known the riches of His glory towards vessels of mercy, which He prepared beforehand for glory, what objection have we to make?" *We* are such vessels of mercy whom God has called not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles. The Scriptures did not fail to mark how the call should be realized. They predicted the wide-spread conversion of the Gentiles. Osee said: I will call the *No-people* My-people and the not-beloved Beloved; and it shall be, in the place where it was said to them: "Not My people you," there they shall be called: "Sons of the living God."

And, on the other hand, Israel's scant response was also written in the prophetic pages. Isaias cries out with regard to Israel: "If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only the remnant shall be saved, for the Lord is going to accomplish fully and make short work of His word on the earth." The same Isaias, contemplating the unbelief of the masses of Israel, said also: "If the Lord of armies had not left us a seed we should have become another Sodom and should be just like Gomorrha."

What has been said up to this leaves a terrific impression. The hearts of men are in the hands of God as clay is in the hands of the potter. What shall we say, then? Shall we call this strange event a fatality? The Gentiles who were not following after the justice of righteousness at all, came to that justice—I mean, of course, that they came to the justice or justness which is from faith. Israel, on the other hand, while pursuing a law leading to that right state of justness, did not attain the regime of justice. In other words, Israel failed. That is the strange contrast. The runners who seemed to be running nowhere reached the goal, while Israel, with its life apparently set in full orientation towards the goal did *not* reach it. What is the reason?

The reason is that they were running wrongly. They started not from faith but from works, and the rock of salvation set before them by God became a stumbling block over which they fell. So it was written in Isaias: "Behold I am placing on Sion a stone of stumbling, and a rock to fall over; but he who sets his belief upon it shall not be confounded."

Brethren, do not think that I am harsh and unsympathetic towards them. The inmost benevolence of my heart and my prayer to God is always for them, that they may be saved. I do bear witness that they have zeal for God; but that zeal is not enlightened by right knowledge. They go on with their eyes shut in ignorance; they mistake the regime of justice established by God; and in seeking to set up their own regime of justice, a man-made righteousness, they have not put themselves under the regime of the justice which God gives. They have misunderstood the purpose of the Law of Moses, for the end of that Law is Christ. Christ is the only source of justice and such He is for the believer.

The Law of Moses, as a law, was concerned with *doing,* and consequently its holiness and its rewards were primarily external. It was a law of temporal blessings for the observant. Thus Moses wrote: "The man who shall have done the justice which comes from the law shall live by it." This "living" is not eternal life, for observance of the Law in view of eternal life is impossible without faith. Now the Law of Moses, as a law, does not command faith but deeds. It was a code that repeated DO, DO, DO or DON'T, DON'T, DON'T—a series of precepts and especially prohibitions. But the JUSTICE which is from faith speaks otherwise. It does not speak of difficult or onerous or impossible precepts. This is what it says: "Do not say in your heart: 'Who will go up to heaven?' (that is, to bring Christ down) or 'Who will go down to the world below?' " (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). We ask: What really does the JUSTICE, which is from faith, say? It says: "The word is near to you, in your mouth and in your heart" (that is, the word of faith which we preach). For, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord, and if you believe with your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you shall be saved. For it is with the heart that one believes in order to receive the state of justice, and it is with the mouth that one confesses in order to obtain salvation. The

Scripture says unambiguously: "Everyone who believes in Him shall not be confounded." For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek. For the same Lord is the Lord of all, rich towards all who invoke Him; yes, "everyone who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved."

But how are they to invoke Him in Whom they have not come to believe? And how shall they come to believe, unless they have first heard? And how shall they hear without someone preaching? And how are men to preach unless they have been sent? There must be accredited preachers and it is of them that it is written (in Isaias): "How beautiful are the feet of those who announce joyful tidings of good things!"

Indeed, the good tidings were openly announced, but all did not obey the good tidings. Listen to Isaias saying: "Lord, who has believed our preaching?" Let us sum matters up, therefore, before we bring in a verdict against Israel. These are the facts: Faith is from hearing, and hearing comes through the preaching of the word of Christ.

Is it possible that they did not hear? No, it is impossible. The preachers of the Gospel have been as much in evidence as the lights of heaven above our heads. We may apply to them the words of the Psalm: "Throughout the whole earth their voice has gone forth: and to the ends of the world their words have resounded."

I ask again: Did Israel, perhaps, not understand? Are they excusable? Moses (in the great Canticle which every Israelite should know) is the first to deny them any such excuse. He says: "I will make you jealous of a nation which is no-nation, in regard to a foolish nation I'll stir up your spite. There is no doubt about it. Israel has had enough vision to be guilty of sin against the light. Hence Isaias boldly says: "I was found by those who did not seek Me: I showed Myself to those who did not inquire after Me." This the Prophet said of the pagans, but of Israel he said: "The whole day long I stretched out my hands to a people unbelieving and rebellious." Where then is the excuse?

However, all is not irremediable desolation. The apostasy is not total, and it is not everlasting. I ask the question: "Has God

rejected His people?" And I answer: "No," that cannot be so, and it is not so. All Israelites are not stubborn infidels. I myself am an Israelite, descended from Abraham, belonging to the tribe of Benjamin. Emphatically, God has not rejected His people which He foreknew. It is now as it was in the days of Elias. You know what the Scripture tells about him, how he impeached Israel in his prayer to God. "Lord," he said, "they have killed Thy Prophets; they have demolished Thy altars; and I am left—I alone—and they are seeking my life." But what did the divine response say: "I have left for Myself 7000 men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal."

It is the same now, at this present time. There is a remnant gratuitously chosen by God which stands faithful. They are the chosen ones of God's grace. And since their fidelity is by grace, it is not the result of works, for in that case grace would not be grace at all. If it is not given gratis, you cannot call it grace. What is our conclusion then? Israel missed. What it had been seeking, that it did not come to obtain, but the chosen group came to find it. The others adhered to their own ideas, and were blinded and hardened, thus fulfilling the Scripture which says: "God gave to them a spirit of stupidity, eyes not to see and ears not to hear up to this present day." Thus said Moses, and David likewise said: "Let their table became a snare and a trap: a stumbling block and a punishment to them: let their eyes be darkened, so as not to see: and bend down their backs, under slavery's burdens, for ever."

Another point: Is Israel's fall definitive? No. Israel's day shall come. Her apostasy is only temporary. They have not fallen so as to remain prostrate forever. God has His plan. Israel is indeed guilty, but by her fall salvation has come to the Gentiles, that the sight of the Gentiles thus enriched with the Messianic blessings might provoke Israel to conversion. And, what that conversion would mean for the world! If their fall means riches for the universe, and, if their failure has made the riches of the Gentiles, what shall not be the grandeur of their full incoming?

Now, I am speaking to you, Gentiles. Inasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I will honour my ministry, having in view at the same time that thereby I may provoke my own people and save some of them. If really their rejection is the

reconciliation of the world with God, what shall their aggregation be but life from the dead?—That is, it will be comparable to a general resurrection. This ultimate destiny of the Jews is secure; their origins guarantee it. For if the first kneaded piece is holy, then the whole lump of dough also is holy. And if the root is holy, the branches also are holy. Any other issue of the matter would be unnatural and unthinkable. The tree (which is the Church) is Jewish, for the root is Jewish. Now, if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a gentile—wild-olive branch that you are—have been grafted into the place of the broken branches; if you have thus come to share the life of the root and the sap of the native olive, do not boast against the broken branches. If you were to boast, you would be acting foolishly, for it is not you that carry the root, but the root that carries you. And, if you should say: The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in—all right—it was by unbelief they were broken off and it was by belief that you were grafted in. Do not think arrogantly, but be afraid. For, if God did not spare the natural branches, neither will He spare you.

See, therefore, the goodness and the severity of God—towards those who have fallen, *severity*, towards you, God's goodness, if you remain true to His goodness. Otherwise you also shall be cut off. And if they do not remain attached to their unbelief, they shall be grafted in. For God is able to graft them in again. Indeed, if you, being naturally an oleaster or wild-olive branch, have been cut off from the wild-olive to which you naturally belonged, and, by a process of an unnatural kind, have been grafted into a good olive, how much more shall not those who are native branches of the good olive be grafted into their own olive.

Apart from arguments of congruity altogether, I tell you definitely that it shall be so. The conversion of the Jews as a nation is decided in the counsels of God. It is a mystery, brethren, that I am making known to you, for I do not want you to be ignorant of this mystery, that you may not be complacent in the wisdom of conceit. I tell you, then, that a blindness, which is partial, has come upon Israel, till the full muster of the gentile nations shall have come into the faith. When that condition shall be fulfilled, then all Israel shall be saved. So it is written in the Prophets:

There shall come from Sion the one who is to save, and he shall turn away impieties from Jacob.

And this is for them the covenant from Me, when I take away their sins.

Considered in view of the Gospel, they are enemies of God, and the profit is yours; but considered in view of the divine election, they are dear to God because of the Patriarchs. For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable.

Listen then. As you once were unbelievers and rebels before God, but now have received mercy on the occasion of their unbelief, so also those who are now unbelievers and rebels, while mercy is accorded to you, must likewise come to the day of mercy. So must your happiness lead to this, namely, that they, one day, may receive mercy. For God has shut up all men in the prison of unbelief and disobedience, that he may have mercy on all.

I can say nothing more, but in the face of this mystery this is the song which comes from my heart: O unfathomable depths of the riches, and the wisdom and the knowledge of God. How inscrutable are His judgments and unsearchable His ways. For, who has known the mind of the Lord? Or, who has been His counsellor? Or who gave to Him first and acquired a right to receive in return. He is first and last. For it is from Him, and through Him and for Him (as last end) that all things are. To Him be the glory forever. Amen.

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Moral Theology

BLESSING OF OIL FOR EXTREME UNCTION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I find it difficult to explain why the only valid remote matter of the sacrament of Extreme Unction is oil consecrated by the Bishop on Holy Thursday. Was this the discipline of the Church from the beginning? Would Extreme Unction be certainly invalid to-day if it were administered with unconsecrated oil, because consecrated oil is unobtainable, as may easily happen in countries under persecution?

SENEX

REPLY.

The evidence available justifies the conclusion that the oil used to anoint the sick was always blessed, even in the early ages of the Church. There is every reason to hold that Extreme Unction given to-day with unconsecrated oil would be invalid. In extraordinary circumstances a priest would be authorised by the Holy See to bless the Oil of the Sick.

From can. 937 of the Code we learn that the sacrament of Extreme Unction is to be administered by using for the anointings olive oil which has been duly blessed; while can. 945 is more explicit and states that the oil must be blessed for this special purpose by a Bishop, or a priest who has the faculty from the Holy See to bless it. At the beginning of the first part of book three of the Code, it is prescribed that the holy oils used in the administration of some of the Sacraments must be blessed by a Bishop on the previous Holy Thursday, and that the parish priest should obtain them from his own Ordinary.[1]

We may pass over the direction that the holy oils are to be blessed on Holy Thursday as having no bearing on the validity of the sacraments in which they are subsequently used. Every Bishop may validly consecrate the oils at any time, by virtue of the fulness of the Priesthood which he possesses. In fact, the Bishops under the S. Congregation of Propaganda Fide may do so lawfully outside Holy Thursday, if need arises.[2] Likewise, the efficacy of the sacrament is not impeded if the oils have been blessed by some other Bishop, though there seems to be an

---

[1]Cann. 734, 735.
[2]Formula maior. n. 2.

obligation of some kind to use the oils blessed by the diocesan Ordinary.[3] Apart from the force of any positive legislation on the matter, it is certainly fitting that the priest shall not avail of the matter blessed by a Bishop other than the local Ordinary, to whom he is subordinate in the exercise of his priesthood.

The remote matter of Extreme Unction is:

(a) oil of olives;

(b) blessed by a Bishop (or a priest who has the faculty from the Holy See);

(c) with the special blessing for the anointing of the sick.

The first of these requirements is absolutely essential; the second is almost certainly necessary, and the third is very probably so.

(a) *Oil of olives.* In the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent it was defined that the sacred anointing of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord as a true sacrament of the New Law, alluded to in the Gospel of St. Mark (6:13) and commended to the faithful and promulgated by the Apostle James, the brother of the Lord, who says: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him" (5:14-15).[4] St. James speaks of anointing with oil. As the word itself suggests, oil is derived from the olive (Lat. *oleum* from *olea,* an olive; and Gr. *elaion*—which is the word used by St. James—from *elaia*). The Fathers of Trent were content to state that the matter of the sacrament was oil, while in the *Decretum pro Armenis* of the Council of Florence (1439) oil of olives was expressly mentioned.[5] Any other oil than that obtained from olives would be invalid matter for the sacrament. Though one can scarcely claim that it has been so proposed by a dogmatic definition of the Church, there is no doubt that olive oil is the remote matter of Extreme Unction.

(b) *The oil used must be blessed by a Bishop.* If we understand this statement in the sense that some blessing is required for the oil, and that the "ordinary" minister of the

[3]It is not clear that this obligation is a grave one. Cf. Cappello. De Sacramentis. Vol. III. (1942) n. 64.
[4]D. 908.
[5]D. 700.

blessing is a Bishop and the "extraordinary" minister a priest, we have the doctrine of the Church as found in the writings of the Fathers, expressed in the official documents of the several Councils, sanctioned in ecclesiastical law, and confirmed by the practice of both East and West.

(i.) *Unblessed oil is not valid matter for Extreme Unction.* The references to this sacrament in the writings of the early Fathers are rare and obscure. Various reasons may be suggested for the absence of treatment of one of the means of obtaining remission of sin instituted by Christ. One possible explanation is that the homilies of the Fathers were directed primarily to the catechumens and dealt rather with sacraments of initiation. The anointing of the sick was not administered publicly in the early Church, any more than it is now, and would not call for such detailed explanation as the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. Further, Extreme Unction is normally received only once in the course of a Christian life, and then it is the complement of Penance. It is such that Origen seems to regard it, when he writes (about A.D. 244) concerning the many ways is which sin may be remitted according to the law of the Gospels. After mentioning Baptism, martyrdom, alms-giving, forgiveness of our neighbour's offences against us, converting the sinner from the way of his iniquity, and the remission that comes with the perfection of charity, he continues: "There is a seventh way of remission of sin, hard and laborious, by means of penance, when the sinner baths his couch with tears . . . and when he is not ashamed to make known his sin to the priest and ask for the remedy according to the saying: I said: I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord, and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of sin (Ps. 31/5). In this is also fulfilled what James the Apostle wrote: Is any man sick among you, let him call the priests of the Church, and let them impose hands upon him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man and, if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."[6] Two ways of obtaining pardon by penance are recalled, one by means of confession to a priest and the other by the anointing according to the writings of St. James. Likewise, St. John Chrysostom (344-407) in his *De Sacerdotio*[7]

[6]In Leviticum Homiliae. Hom. 24. Rouet de Journel. Enchiridion Patristicum. 493. P.G. XII. 418-9.

[7]De Sacerdotio. Lib. 3, 5 and 6. Ench.Patr. 1119, 1120. P.G. XLVIII, 643-4.

deals with the power of remission of sin left to the priest; and having shown it from the words of Christ when conferring the power of binding and loosing (Mt. 18:18) and granting of the power to forgive or retain sin (Jn. 20:23), he quotes St. James further to support his statement that the priests forgive sins not only when they regenerate us (i.e. in Baptism) but also after our regeneration. They thus differ from our earthly parents who give us life, but are unable to ward off death or cure us from advancing sickness.

Penance and Extreme Unction seem to have been linked together in the minds of the early writers as means of forgiveness of sin after Baptism, and more frequent and explicit references are to be expected to the power of the keys which would be availed of not only in time of sickness, but after serious lapse at any period of life.

It is not surprising that the early patristic writings which contain so few references to the sacrament itself, would not provide us with a detailed knowledge of what later theologians termed its matter and form. However, from the fourth century onwards the teaching of the Church becomes more clearly discernible. In the Euchologion or Sacramentary of St. Seraphion, who was a contemporary and friend of St. Atanasius and Bishop of Thmuis in the Nile Delta, we have a very valuable testimony. The Euchologion contains thirty prayers, the seventeenth of which is a blessing of the oil of the sick upon which God is implored to send the power of healing as a means to overcome all sickness and infirmity, as a remedy against all the demons . . . to destroy all fever and cold and every weakness, for good grace and the remission of sins, for a medicine of life and salvation, for health and soundness of soul, body and spirit, for perfect strengthening.[8] Not ordinary oil, but that which has been blessed is used for the rite which from its effects can justly be considered the same as was known later as the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

At the beginning of the fifth century, we find the important witness of St. Innocent I (401-407) in a letter to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubinum (Gubbio). There is no doubt, the Pope writes, that the words of St. James: Is there any one sick among you, etc., must be taken and understood as referring to the faithful who are sick, who are anointed with the holy oil of

[8]Ench.Patr. 1241.

chrism, prepared by the Bishop, for the use of anointing not only by priests, but by all Christians in their own of their families' necessity.[9] The letter continues by answering in the affirmative a question submitted by Decentius whether a Bishop could anoint the sick, for, writes Pope St. Innocent, there can be no doubt that a Bishop may do what is lawful to a priest. "Priests are spoken of for the reason that the Bishops could not visit all the sick because of their other occupations. A Bishop, however, can bless and anoint a sick person without hesitation, if it be possible for him to do so, or if he thinks the person is worthy to be visited by him. It is the Bishop who prepares the chrism and so why may he not use it?" Moreover, "the oil is not to be poured over the penitents, for it belongs to the class of sacrament, and since they are denied the other sacraments, why should this be given them?" The letter concludes: "We have taken pains to reply to all these questions, which you have proposed to us, to the best of our power, so that your church may keep and follow the custom of Rome from which it had its origins." The Letter of Pope St. Innocent gives us the tradition of the Roman Church. There is the anointing done by the priests over the sick according to the words of St. James. The oil of chrism is blessed by the Bishop, who may most certainly administer the rite of anointing if circumstances require it. This is to be given only to those who have been reconciled after their sins and are admitted to the other sacraments. The word "sacrament" had not then its strict technical sense, but the rite performed by the priests with chrism blessed by the Bishop would, in modern theological language, be called the sacrament of Extreme Unction, and its matter holy oil consecrated by a Bishop.

The Venerable Bede (674-735), of whom it is said that he

---

[9]D. 99. P.L. XX, 559. Quod non est dubium de fidelibus aegrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui sancto oleo chrismatis perungi possunt, quod ab episcopo confectum, non solum sacerdotibus sed et omnibus Christianis licet in sua et suorum necessitate ungendum. . . . The meaning of this sentence is not altogether clear and different explanations have been given. Perhaps it refers to a custom of using blessed oil to anoint the sick, apart from the sacramental unction performed by the priest (Cf. apud Billuart. De Extrema Unctione. Art. V). More probably, however, it means that the anointing is to be given not only to priests who are sick but to all the faithful. The Bishop consecrates the chrism—a generic name for blessed oil, or perhaps oil with which is mixed some balsam or other such substance—for the benefit or use of both priests and faithful. The priests usually administer the anointing, but there is no reason why the Bishop may not do so, if he desires. (Cf. Billot. De Sacramentis. Vol. II, p. 257, note 3: also Migne 1. c. 560, note f.)

so closely followed the doctrine of the Fathers in his exposition of the Scriptures that he would give no teaching unless it were confirmed by their authority, treats expressly of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction in his Commentary on the Epistle of St. James.[10] Taking the words *Et orent super eum* he writes: We read in the Gospel that the Apostles did this, and now the custom of the Church is that the sick be anointed with consecrated oil with prayer by the priests, and be healed. He continues by referring to the words of Pope St. Innocent I, given above, that the oil is to be used not only by priests but by all Christians; and adds that the oil is not to be prepared except by the Bishop.

Examples of other testimonies may be found in the text books, but we will cite two which may have a special interest. It is narrated in the life of St. Eoghan or Eugene or preferably Owen, Bishop of Ardstraw (which later became merged with the Diocese of Derry), about the beginning of the sixth century, that as his end approached, advanced in years and rich in merit, he was stricken by a serious illness. As the sickness grew worse, the whole assembly of monks was gathered, and his venerable body was anointed with holy oil, and fortified for his departure by the never-failing Viaticum.[11] Finally, the *Liber Poenitentialis,* which is attributed to S. Theodore of Canterbury (A.D. 690) enjoins that the sick who are in danger of death are to be asked to make a sincere confession of their sins . . . and according to canonical authority and the commands of the holy Fathers are to be anointed by the sacred unction and be nourished by the Holy Viaticum, lest the gates of piety and the prayers and consolations of the Church should seem to be closed against them.[12] "Holy Oil" and "Sacred Unction" would imply that the oil was blessed.

Particular Councils held under the patronage of Charlemagne and his successors dealt specifically with the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. The second Council of Chalons (813), which was attended by the Bishops of the Province of Lyons, enacted: "According to the teaching of the blessed Apostle James, with which the teaching of the Fathers is in agreement, the sick should be anointed by the priests with oil which is blessed by the Bishop."[13] Likewise, the Council of Aquisgrana (Aachen) in

[10]Super divi Iacobi Epistolam. Cap. 5. P.L. XCIII, 39.
[11]Acta Sanctorum. 23 Augusti. p. 627.
[12]Migne. Cursus Completus Theologiae. XXIV. 52.
[13]Mansi. Vol. 14. 104.

the year 836 legislated concerning the sacrament of Extreme Unction, and enjoined that on Holy Thursday of each year the "Bishops are not to neglect the anointing of the sick with sacred oil, in which we believe salvation is to be found for the infirm . . . but the anointing is to be performed most devoutly according to the tradition of the Apostles. . . ."[14] It is hardly likely that the sick were anointed only on Holy Thursday; and the meaning seems to be that the matter for the anointing is to be blessed by the Bishop on that day.

Among the Schoolmen, there was general agreement that the matter of the sacrament of Extreme Unction was oil consecrated by the Bishop. The question about which they differed was whether the sacrament was instituted directly by Christ himself or by the Apostles in virtue of the authority given them by our Saviour. Concerning the oil to be used in Extreme Unction, we have two articles of St. Thomas in the Supplement of the Summa, taken from the *Commentarium in Quartum Sententiarum.* Article V of Question XXIX is: *Utrum oporteat oleum esse consecratum?* The following article asks: *Utrum oporteat materiam huius sacramenti esse consecratam ab Episcopo?* To both questions the answer is in the affirmative. The oil should be consecrated for three reasons. Firstly, the efficacy of the sacraments comes from Christ. In those sacraments which He used, the material things were given the power of sanctifying souls when He used them, as happened when He imparted supernatural efficacy to water at His baptism. He did not, however, at any time use oil for the purpose of giving grace and salvation, nor did He submit to any anointing. Consequently, the efficacy of the oil must be derived from the blessing of the ministers of the Church. Secondly, the plenitude of grace which Extreme Unction confers, namely the remission not only of sin but of the effects of sin, requires that it have a special virtue, which comes from the blessing it receives. Thirdly, the restoration to bodily health, which follows from this sacrament, is beyond the natural properties of the oil, and is given it by the blessing conferred on it. The oil should be blessed by the Bishop, as the efficacy of the sacraments descends from Christ in a set order—to the people through the ministrations of the dispensers of the sacraments, and to the lesser ministers from

[14]Mansi. ib. 678.

their superiors, who sanctify the matter which is applied by the priest to the faithful.

In both these articles, the Angelic Doctor shows the reasonableness of the truths which we know from revelation and the teaching of the Church. He does not here set out to prove the doctrine, but rather accepts it and shows how it is in accordance with the right order of things.

It is not without reason, then, that Pope Innocent III in 1208 included the sentence: *Unctionem infirmorum cum oleo consecrato veneramur,* in the Profession of Faith demanded of the Waldenses,[15] and that in the *Decretum pro Armenis* of the Council of Florence it was stated that matter of Extreme Unction is oil blessed by the Bishop.[16] The Fathers of Trent aptly summed up the question, when after quoting the words of St. James they added: "In which words, as the Church has learned from apostolic tradition received from hand to hand, he (i.e. St. James) teaches the matter, form, proper administration and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church has understood that the matter is the oil blessed by the Bishop, because the anointing very aptly represents the grace of the Holy Ghost with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed. The form, furthermore, consists of those words: By this anointing, etc."[17]

From what has been written, it would seem that a blessing is required for the oil used to anoint the sick, in the sacrament of Extreme Unction. The recurring words "consecrated oil," "sacred oil," "sacred unction," and the existence of ancient rites of blessing leave little doubt that blessed oil was always used. The constant appeal to apostolic tradition as the source of this observance would make us hesitate to hold any other doctrine but that the sacrament cannot be validly administered with unblessed oil. Additional weight is given to the argument when we recall that the Council of Trent asserts that the Church has always understood from the doctrine of St. James that the matter of the sacrament was oil blessed (by the Bishop).

Another proof of the necessity of using consecrated oil is drawn from the usage of the Oriental Churches. It is true that the Eastern practice is somewhat different, as the oil is blessed

---

[15]D. 424.
[16]D. 700.
[17]D. 908.

by the priest who administers the sacrament. This custom has existed for many centuries and may be traced back beyond the break between East and West at the great Schism. How or when it arose is uncertain, but in the East as well as in the West, unblessed oil is not considered sufficient for Extreme Unction. If we ask whether the oil should be blessed for the validity of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, and apply the principle: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,* there is only one answer. No trace is found in tradition of ordinary oil being used in any circumstances, while some mention of a blessing is rarely lacking in the documents of ecclesiastical tradition. The reason would seem to be that there would be no true sacrament without consecrated oil.

(ii) *The "ordinary" minister of the blessing of the oil of the sick is the Bishop.* As far as the Western Church is concerned, there is no doubt about this statement, as it follows from the conciliar decrees quoted already, as well as from can. 945 of the Code. It is also certain that a priest can be authorised to bless the oil for Extreme Unction. The priests of the Eastern Rites enjoy this faculty, and it is admitted the sacrament they administer is valid.[18] Also, the Code expressly states that oil blessed by a Bishop or a priest who has the faculty to bless it from the Holy See is the matter for the sacrament.

To the further question whether a priest may validly bless the oil of the sick without the authority of the Holy See, the answer must be that in the present discipline of the Church, Latin priests do not receive this delegation tacitly, as may be conceded in the case of those belonging to the Eastern Rites. For our guidance, there are some pertinent decisions of the Holy See. On 14th September, 1842, the Holy Office replied in the negative to the query: Whether in case of necessity the parish priest could use oil blessed by himself for the valid conferring of the sacrament of Extreme Unction. The answer referred to a previous decision, given in 1611, that oil not consecrated by episcopal consecration could be validly used for Extreme Unction

[18]Cf. Benedict XIV. De Synodo Dioecesana. Lib. VIII., cap.1., n. 4. Posse saltem ex commissione, sive expressa sive tacita, R.Pontificis a simplici sacerdote praeparari materiam aptam ad conficiendum sacramentum extremae unctionis res videtur exploratissima quam nemini liceat in quaestionem adducere, siquidem in Ecclesia orientali mos viget, a mille et amplius annis ab ea recepta ut ipsimet presbyteri oleum benedicant.

was rash and close to error.[19] Likewise, in 1878 (15th May) the Holy Office considered the case of a priest who was called to a dying man who was unconscious, and because the consecrated oil was not available would bless the oil himself and administer to the sick person the only sacrament of which he was capable. The decision was that such a practice was not to be approved or even tolerated.[20] It is definitely not the intention of the Holy See to give faculties implicitly to a Latin priest to bless the oil of the sick. Some would admit as probable that in time of persecution, when all communication with the Bishop or the Holy See was interrupted and this condition of affairs was likely to last for a long time, with general detriment to the salvation of souls deprived of the sacrament of the dying, a priest could reasonably presume the faculty which would certainly be granted to him, if he had the opportunity to request it and receive the answer.[21]

(c) The oil for Extreme Unction must be blessed for this special purpose. The proper matter of this sacrament is *oleum infirmorum*, not either of the other two oils which are likewise blessed on Holy Thursday. The precept of can. 945 imposes an obligation, which apart from what is to be remarked concerning the validity of the sacrament appears to be a serious one. Whether oil of the sick is required for the validity of the Extreme Unction is a debated question among the theologians. Certainly, chrism or oil of catechumens are oil blessed by the Bishop, and no more specific requirement is found in the decrees of Councils or the teachings of the Fathers. On the other hand, holy oil which is blessed for another purpose would seem to be no more apt to produce the remission of sin and the restoration to spiritual and bodily health than oil which has not been blessed at all. For practical purposes, only oil of the sick can be called certainly valid matter of the sacrament of the sick; the other two oils are doubtful matter. In an emergency, when the proper oil were not at hand, Extreme Unction could be administered *sub conditione* with chrism or oil of catechumens. If the sick person survived till oil of the sick were procured, he should be anointed again conditionally to make certain of the effects of the sacrament.

---

[19]Collectanea de Propaganda Fide. I., n. 956.
[20]Ibid. II., n. 1494.
[21]Cappello. Op. cit. n. 56.

THE MORALITY OF GAMBLING

The question of gambling seems to provide an ever recurring subject of public controversy. There are some, especially among our non-Catholic friends, who would condemn gambling outright as an evil in every respect; others would lament its prevalence as fostering covetousness, undermining the security of family life, and killing incentive to earn a living by honest work. On the other hand, its supporters consider it a possible means to better their financial position and a form of relaxation from the anxieties of life. Its promoters claim it is an inducement to the public to part with their money for some deserving cause, without the usual protestations which most of us voice before opening our purses. As often happens when opinions are forcefully expressed, the underlying principles tend to become obscured, and the objective force of a great deal of what is said is not sufficiently heeded. It may be worth while, at this juncture, to recall the principles on which the morality of what is commonly called gambling can be calmly considered.

The Oxford Dictionary gives the meaning of "gamble" as being "to play games of chance for money (especially for high stakes); to stake money (especially to an extravagant amount) on some fortuitous event." The same authority considers the word "gamble" in its proper significance a term of reproach, which would not be applied to a wager for a trifling amount, except by those who condemn playing for money altogether. However, let us take the word in the meaning it seems to have in current use, as an agreement whereby the ownership of money or other temporal possessions is transferred, dependent on the verification of certain contingencies. It is a contract which by mutual consent transfers certain rights—at least the right to hope for the lawful possession of goods not now owned; and when the uncertain future event becomes certain, one of the parties has the right to actual possession, since his hope has been realised. Sometimes a payment is made by one party at the moment the contract is made, as happens when a ticket is purchased in a lottery, etc. Whenever the element of chance determines the object of the contract, we have a gamble. Of course, there is chance in almost every commercial undertaking, but business transactions are binding and can be enforced independent of circumstances not expressly provided for in the terms of the contract.

In our acceptance of the word, insurance is a gamble. Titius pays a Company an agreed sum of money; and if his house be burned, the Company will compensate him to the amount stated on the policy. The uncertain event is the destruction of the house by fire. Titius pays the premium and the Company accepts the risk. In return for the premium, it has given Titius a right to demand the amount of the policy, should he suffer the loss of his house through fire. The amount of the premium will depend not only on the value of the policy, but also on the nature of the risk involved. Insurance on a wooden building is dearer than on one constructed of brick, stone or other incombustible material, and so on. The risk is calculated by experts, and both sides agree that what they bind themselves to do is fair and equitable. Should there be no fire, the Company is better off; in the event of a fire, Titius is paid the money and can, if he wishes, build a new house. Insurance has become so much a part of modern life, that no one considers it a matter of doubtful morality, but a prudent investment against unforeseen loss. It is even possible to insure against such a highly unpredictable event as the falling of rain between certain hours.

Gambling, in the sense we are more accustomed to, includes (i) games of chance for stakes; (ii) betting, and (iii) lotteries, raffles, art unions, spinning wheels and 'housie.' The difference between them and insurance is not so important: it is merely this, that they are entered on, not with a view to compensation in the event of loss, but for the purpose of gain in the event of a favourable outcome of the contingent incident.

(i) A game is something undertaken chiefly for amusement. To give further interest to the game, a prize is often awarded to the winner. There are games of skill and games of chance, as well as games where both elements must be considered. Even in games of skill, there is always some chance or luck, as we call it, to be contended with; but the intention of the players is that the better team or the better man or the best horse, etc., will win.

The luck of the game is incidental. Games of chance depend largely on unforeseen events, such as the fall of the cards, the throw of the dice, etc. Skill and practice do enliven the game, though it is unfair to take advantage of a beginner, unless he is aware that he runs more than the usual risk of losing. Then, there are games where both luck and skill contribute to the victory, as in some card games. When money or other valuable consideration is staked on the result of a game of chance, we

have gambling in the sense that the result depends principally on fortuitous events. Money staked on a game of skill is rather another form of gambling—a bet.

(ii) A bet or wager is "the backing of an affirmation or forecast by offering to forfeit, in the case of an adverse issue, a sum of money or article of value, to one who by accepting, maintains the opposite, and backs his opinion by a corresponding stipulation," or it is "the staking of money or other value on the event of doubtful issue." A familiar example is a bet on the issue of a race. The follower of the turf places money with a gentleman known as a bookmaker, who contracts to pay a certain sum, calculated according to the estimated chances of the horse, if he actually succeeds in passing the post first. Should the horse not win the race, the bookmaker keeps the stake. Betting may also be indulged in by the use of mechanical devices, which expose various combinations of pictures, and in the event of certain combinations turning out, the person who inserted his coin and set the mechanism in motion, receives a prize. It is alleged that these machines are loaded against the customer; but if he is aware of this fact, and still wishes to try his luck, no injustice is done him on this score.

(iii) Lotteries and such like are arrangements for the distribution of prizes by chance among persons purchasing tickets. Slips or marbles, etc., numbered in correspondence with the tickets, are drawn from a barrel or other container, or the issue is decided on the turn of a wheel which carries the same numbers as the tickets.

It is the morality of games of chance for money, betting on sporting events, mechanical betting devices, lotteries, art unions, housie and similar transfer of ownership on the result of chance that we must decide.

Viewed in themselves they are all valid contracts, binding in justice on both sides. The ultimate reason for the transfer of ownership is the consent of the parties, which produces its final effect when the issue of the unforeseen event is known. Ownership (*dominium plenum*) implies the power to dispose of a possession according to the will of the owner. He may bind himself to exchange it with another for a price, or he may alienate it gratis, or even destroy it if he wishes. In all these cases, he validly exercises his right of ownership; and there is no reason why he could not also bind himself to alienate his goods dependent on the result of an event which is not foreseen with any degree of

certainty; to give to another a right to claim his goods, if the contingent event comes to pass. The contingent events we have in mind at present are the result of a game of chance, the vindication of his prediction of some future happening, the drawing of a certain ticket or number from a barrel, etc. Provided he enters the contract freely, fully aware of the risk he runs of losing, and provided also the rules of the game or lottery are strictly observed, no injury is done him; and within the limits of what is provided by law for the sake of the common good, he may claim and accept with thankfulness what he wins. In most cases, he will have paid his stake before the event, in the hope of receiving it back with the addition of his winnings; but if he loses, he must bear the loss with a good grace. If he has not paid the stake in advance, and the civil law will not protect the contract, he may probably take advantage of the law; but it is rightly considered a despicable thing to refuse to pay "debts of honour," which cannot be enforced by action of the courts.

To stake money which is not our own is an invalid contract, as we cannot transfer or bind ourselves to transfer the ownership of another's goods. It would be equally invalid to offer prizes which are not the property of those who pretend to have the disposal of them.

Just as every valid contract is not necessarily lawful, so also with the contract we are considering. Though we may validly alienate what is our own, we may not lawfully do so, if there exist obligations which urge us to use it for some other purpose. A man who bets with money over which others have a claim in payment of lawful debts, commits a sin of injustice, since he places himself in the position of being unable to discharge his obligations of justice. The father of a family who expends his weekly wage or salary in gambling commits a sin against the virtue of piety, which can be serious, if he deprives his dependents of the necessities of life according to their rightful station. Charity and religion can also be violated, if the means that should be devoted to these causes are squandered in gambling. In brief, we may state that the man who gambles what is his own, and what he is not obliged to spend in other ways, is quite free to do so. Excessive gambling would be extravagance and a sin of prodigality, which is seldom of serious import, unless it be more or less a habit and is sure to lead to disaster.

The prize offered should be something which it is lawful for one party to alienate and for the other to possess, in the event

of his winning. Some proportion should also exist between the risk run, the amount staked and the prizes offered. As a rule, there will be little practical difficulty about this, as persons are naturally reluctant to risk their money without a reasonable hope of receiving something in return, unless the so-called gamble is for a charitable purpose and they consider it in the nature of a donation to a good cause.

Abuses can easily arise in connection with gambling, and they can become a public danger if not guarded against. It is for this reason that the State has legislated concerning them. While such civil laws may be regarded as purely penal, there can be an incidental obligation from charity towards oneself or others not to incur the danger of unwelcome publicity, heavy fines or other penalties inflicted on those who break the law. It has been said that the gaming contract is immoral because it is against the precept "Thou shalt not covet." The tenth commandment forbids us to covet our neighbour's goods, which, of course, means to desire to have them unjustly. If we desire something we see in a shop window and resolve to steal it, or would wish to be able to steal it, we violate the commandment of the decalogue; but if we decide to have it by paying the price marked on the article, we commit no sin. Likewise, when we pay a price to have our name included in a lottery and hope we win it, what harm is done? We have bought the right to have our number in the barrel, and if it is drawn out as the winning number, the prize is justly ours for the claiming.

The dangers and abuses of gambling are accidental, and their impact on the morality of a particular act or series of acts must be measured by the virtue of prudence. *Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt.* The desire for gambling can be very strong, and in some individuals almost irresistible. Is it prudent to place extraordinary temptations in the way of those who will almost surely succumb? The question of the prudence comes more to the foreground when the public estimation of the Church is affected. The Fathers of the Fourth Plenary Council thought it wise to forbid priests to bet with bookmakers.

The act of gambling is *per se* lawful, *per accidens* unlawful; all the circumstances must be weighed, when judging the morality of a particular act.

JAMES MADDEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Canon Law

SIMULATION AND THE CANONICAL IRREGULARITY OF THE ABUSE OF SACRED ORDERS

Canon 985 of the Code of Canon Law enumerates the various canonical irregularities to Sacred Ordination that arise from crime (*irregularitates ex delicto*). The seventh section of that canon contains the irregularity of the abuse of Sacred Orders, and it states: "(The following are irregular from crime): Those who exercise an act of major orders which is reserved to those who possess that major order, if they have not received that order or if, having received it, they have been forbidden to exercise it by a canonical penalty, whether personal, medicinal or vindictive, or local."[1] It is clear even from this mere statement of the irregularity that it consists of two distinct parts.[2] The first part attaches irregularity to the exercise of an act of major orders by one who does not possess the major order to which the act is proper; and the second part attaches irregularity to the exercise of an act of major orders by one who does possess the requisite major order but who is prohibited from exercising it by a canonical penalty. Thus, for example, a layman who attempts to hear confessions and give absolution incurs this irregularity because he certainly usurps the exercise of an act of major orders, which in this case is reserved to clerics who possess the sacred order of Priesthood.[3] But a priest who does not possess the necessary approbation to hear confessions, and who nevertheless does hear confessions, does not incur the irregularity. He lacks the necessary jurisdiction, and thus he acts unlawfully and invalidly; but he does not wrongfully usurp an act of major

---

[1]"(Sunt irregulares ex delicto): Qui actum ordinis, clericis in ordine sacro constitutis reservatum, ponunt, vel eo ordine carentes, vel ab eius exercitio poena canonica sive personali, medicinali aut vindicativa, sive locali prohibiti."

[2]The reason for this twofold aspect of the irregularity is to be found in its historical origin and development, for before the Code the subject-matter of the present canonical irregularity constituted two separate irregularities.

[3]Canon 871: "Minister huius sacramenti (poenitentiae) est solus sacerdos."

orders because by ordination to the Priesthood he has received the order necessary for the hearing of confessions. On the other hand, however, if such a priest had been suspended *a divinis* he would incur the irregularity under its second aspect, since he would have exercised an act of major orders from the exercise of which—even though he actually possessed the order—he was prohibited by the canonical penalty of suspension *a divinis*.

Many questions arising from this irregularity are discussed by the authors, and the purpose of this article is to take up and discuss one of these questions, namely, as to whether the simulation of the forbidden act of orders is sufficient to induce the irregularity. That is: Is the irregularity incurred if a person (lay or cleric as regards the first part of the irregularity, and cleric in major orders only as regards the second part) simulates the act of major orders, i.e., seriously performs the external rite without the necessary intention? An examination of this question would be incomplete unless the discussions of the authors before the Code are included, for not only did they consider this question at reasonable length, but in fact they left little more to be said about the question in its various phases.

At the very outset it can be said that the majority of these pre-Code authors, even to the point of constituting a moral unanimity, maintained the opinion that the simulated performance of an act of orders *could* produce irregularity, although they differed somewhat in determining the precise circumstances in which this could occur. There were only a few exceptions, that is, a few authors who held the opinion that simulation always excluded even the possibility of incurring irregularity. Thus, for example, Navarrus required for the incurrence of irregularity the solemn performance of the external act with the intention of performing a true exercise of orders, so that if this internal element was lacking the irregularity was not incurred in the internal forum although in the external forum the agent was presumed truly to have exercised the sacred ministry.[4] This opinion also found support in the writings of

---

[4]Navarrus, M., Commentaria et Tractatus, Tom. II, Venetiis 1601, cap. XXVII, n.242.

Ugolinus[5] and Bonacina.[6] However, this opinion was generally rejected by the authors.

In answering this question concerning the simulated exercise of orders the canonists commonly made a distinction between two different kinds of acts of orders: (a) The first category comprised those acts which were complete in themselves, and which did not in any way depend on the intention of the agent; an example was a ceremony such as the solemn singing of the Gospel with the stole, so that a sub-deacon who performed this function in this way simply usurped an act proper to a higher major order and any intention on his part not to act as a true deacon did not affect the case; (b) the second category comprised those acts the value of which depended on the intention of the agent who must possess the proper intention; examples were ordination itself, sacramental absolution, etc.[7] All of these authors agreed that, in regard to both irregularities under consideration,[8] simulation caused irregularity if the act of orders performed belonged to the first of these two categories; but a difference of opinion existed concerning the simulated performance of acts belonging to the second category. Those authors who maintained that the simulated exercise of acts belonging to the second category, that is, of acts the value of which depended on the intention of the agent, did not produce irregularity, reasoned that in such circumstances an essential element of the act was lacking and thus the person did not objectively exercise an act of orders; and moreover, added Lega, in order that an act should be a criminal act—and a crime was necessary for the contraction of

---

[5]Ugolinus, B., Tractatus de Irregularitatibus, Venetiis, 1601, cap. XXXVII, n. 10.

[6]Bonacina, M., Opera Omnia, Tom. I, Tractatus de Censuris Aliisque Poenis Ecclesiasticis, Lugduni, 1741, disp. VII, qu. III, punct. VI, n.2. Viva also quotes Bonacina and approves this opinion; cfr. Viva, D., Cursus Theologico-Moralis, Tom. IV, Pars VIII, De Censuris, Ferrariae, 1757, qu. IX, art. I, n. 3.

[7]Cfr. Gasparri, P., Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione, Vol. I, Parisiis, 1893, n. 337; D'Annibale, J., Summula Theologiae Moralis, Vol. I, ed. 5, Romae, 1908, n.411, footnote 29; Lega, M., Praelectiones in Textum Juris Canonici, De Delictis et Poenis, ed. 2, Romae, 1910, n. 260.

[8]This phraseology is justified since, as has already been pointed out, this irregularity as expressed in the Code can arise from two distinct juridical causes, namely, the exercise of orders not possessed and the exercise of orders prohibited by ecclesiastical penalty. Moreover, in the pre-Code period they were expressd in the law as distinct irregularities.

these irregularities—nothing should be wanting; it should be a complete act.[9]

Other authors, however, defended the stricter opinion that, at least in regard to the irregularity arising from the exercise of orders not possessed, even the acts of the second category produced irregularity. Their principal reason was that the law which imposed this irregularity was directed towards the external usurpation of acts of orders not received, and thus to incur this irregularity it was sufficient to have the serious intention of performing the external act in a solemn manner; especially since the person who did not possess the order and who seriously and solemnly exercised the external function performed the order to the fullest extent of which he was capable.[10] Moreover, it seemed to these authors that, unless this was maintained, it would have to be said that the acts of the second category could never produce the irregularity of the abuse to orders not received, because a person who knew that he did not possess the order he was exercising could not possibly intend anything more than this external exercise; for, knowing that he did not possess the order, he could not possibly intend to act as a true possessor of the order.[11]

However, some of these authors did not adhere to this stricter opinion when speaking of simulation in relation to the contraction of the irregularity arising from the violation of ecclesiastical censure, an irregularity which, of course, supposed the possession of the orders which were exercised. These canonists held that this irregularity was not contracted if simulation occurred in regard to those actions which depended on the intention of the agent, because in such a case it could not be said that a real exercise of an order had been performed; it was only a fiction.[12]

---

[9]Lega, op. cit., n. 260; cfr. also D'Annibale, op. cit., n. 411, footnote 29.

[10]Cfr. Suarez, F., Opera Omnia, Tom. XXIII, De Censuris, Pars I et II, Parisiis, 1861, disp. XL, sect. IV, n. 18; Pichler, V., Jus Canonicum, Tom. 1, Pisauri, 1758, Lib. V, Tit. XXVIII, n. 3; Schmalzgrueber, F., Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum, Tom. V, Pars II, Romae, 1845, Lib. V, Tit. XXVIII, n. 12; Boenninghausen, E., Tractatus Iuridico-Canonicus de Irregularitatibus, Fascic. I, Monasterii, 1863, pp. 200-203; Gasparri, op. cit., n. 337.

[11]Cfr. Suarez, op. cit., disp. XL, sect. IV, n. 18; Schmalzgrueber, op. cit., Lib. V, Tit. XXVIII, n. II.

[12]Cfr. Suarez, op. cit., disp. XL, sect. III, n. 14; Pichler, op. cit., Lib. V, Tit. XXVII, n. 3; Maschat, R., Institutiones Canonicae, Pars II, Ferrariae, 1760, Lib. V, Tit. XXVII, n. 3; Schmalzgrueber, op. cit., Lib. V, Tit. XXVII, n. 25.

Boenninghausen merely expressed this teaching in another way when he declared that this irregularity was not incurred by the invalid performance of an act of orders if the nullity was the consequence of the lack of intention on the part of the agent, because in this hypothesis the agent did not wish to place an act of orders and in fact did not do so.[13]

These same authors, however, held that the irregularity was certainly contracted if the agent had the necessary intention, even if the act was invalid on account of some other cause, whether the agent was aware of this or not. Their reason was that on the part of the agent in this case it was an active use of the power of orders to the fullest extent of which he was capable, and this was what was prohibited by the irregularity.[14] Gasparri, however, did not support this change of attitude in regard to the simulated performance of the acts belonging to the second category. He maintained that the same should be said here as was said concerning the first irregularity and for the same reason, namely, that the law intended to affect the external exercise of the orders which were prohibited.[15]

This pre-Code controversy concerning simulation and the contraction of the irregularity of the abuse of Sacred Orders has carried over into the period following the promulgation of the Code, especially since the Code itself does not contain any explicit ruling on the point, while there has not been any authoritative decision having a bearing on the question. Thus, the canonists are still undecided.[16]

Prescinding from the practical conclusions from this controversy, to which reference will shortly be made, the opinion which maintains that irregularity may be incurred by simulation even in regard to those acts of major orders which require the

---

[13]Boenninghausen, op. cit., fascic. I. p. 163.

[14]Cfr. Suarez, op. cit., disp. XL, sect. III, n. 15; Pichler, op. cit., Lib. V, Tit. XXVII, n. 3; Tamburinus, T., Theologia Moralis, Tom. II, Venetiis, 1755, Lib. X, Tr. IV, cap. XIV, sect II, n. 17; Maschat, op. cit., Lib. V, Tit. XXVII, n. 3; Boenninghausen, op. cit., fascic. I, p. 164.

[15]Gasparri, op. cit., n. 370.

[16]Cfr. Coronata, M., (A.), Institutiones Iuris Canonici, Tractatus Canonicus de Sacramentis, Vol. II, De Ordine, ed. 2, Taurini, 1949, n. 147 (where he gives a brief account of the situation) and n. 149; Hickey, J., Irregularities and Simple Impediments in the New Code of Canon Law, Washington, 1920, p. 70; Wernz, F. X.—Vidal, P., Ius Canonicum, Tom. IV, De Rebus, Vol. I, Romae, 1934, n. 254, footnote 474.

intention of the agent for validity,[17] appears to be the more likely opinion. At least three considerations prompt our preference for this opinion:

(a) Irregularities have as their purpose the protection and maintenance of the respect and reverence due to the dignity of the clerical state. But this respect and dignity are violated by the serious, external and unlawful exercise of orders in the sense explained in Canon 985, § 7, even without that internal intention which the act may require for its value as such.

(b) The law concerning this irregularity before the Code, of which the Code law is a substantial repetition, seemed both in its origin and development to aim at imposing a disqualification on account of the external exercise of the order, without taking into account the intention or lack of intention on the part of the agent; and this again is in conformity with the nature of irregularity as such, which is concerned with the external order of things. Thus, the opinion to which we have given our preference seems to us to be more in conformity with the nature of irregularity as such, and also in keeping with the tenor of Canon 6 of the Code which contains provisions governing the relationships between pre-Code law and the law of the Code itself.

(c) The present law of the Code speaks simply of the placing of an act of major orders (*"qui actum ordinis . . . ponunt"*), and the serious external performance of the act is sufficient to fulfil this requirement. There is no distinction between the valid and invalid performance of the act; and if there is no distinction, there is no exception.

However, with a view to a practical solution the question may be summarized in the following propositions:

(a) Simulation gives rise to the irregularity in regard to the performance of those acts of major orders which according to their institution by the Church are complete in themselves independently of any intention on the part of the agent. There is general agreement on this point.

(b) With regard to those acts of major orders which require

[17]That is, those acts which belong to the second of the two categories previously mentioned.

the proper intention of the agent and the value of which depends on the existence of this intention, the contraction of the irregularity cannot be urged if simulation takes place. The reason is that at least a doubt of law must be said to exist, and in such a doubt the law does not bind.[18]

However, especially on account of the opinion to which preference has been given above, the following comment is offered in regard to this second general practical conclusion. At least a distinction should be made between the simulated performance of such acts by those who are incapable of performing them validly and their simulated performance by those who are capable of performing them validly. When such acts are simulated by those who cannot perform them validly it is difficult to see why the irregularity should not be incurred, not only on account of the three general reasons already given, but also because these perform the acts to the fullest extent of which they are capable, since it is impossible for them to act, or to have the genuine intention of acting, as those who really possess the necessary power to act validly. Moreover, it seems unlikely, to say the least, that the irregularity should certainly be incurred for the simulated performance of those acts which do not depend on the intention of the agent and which may be described as being of less importance, and yet not incurred for the simulated performance of such acts as Eucharistic Consecration, sacramental absolution, etc., by those who are incapable of performing them validly; all the more so, since it is precisely such acts which are punished by the legislator in a special way in Canon 2322.[19]

G. C. GALLEN.

St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.

---

[18]Canon 15: "Leges, etiam irritantes et inhabilitantes, in dubio iuris non urgent . . ."

[19]Canon 2322: "Ad ordinem sacerdotalem non promotus: I° Si Missae celebrationem simulaverit aut sacramentalem confessionem exceperit, excommunicationem ipso facto contrahit, speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatam; et insuper laicus quidem privetur pensione aut munere, si quod habeat in Ecclesia, aliisque poenis pro gravitate culpae puniatur; clericus vero deponatur . . ."

Liturgy

OMISSION OF LEONINE PRAYERS—ENGLISH HYMNS AT BEGINNING AND END OF MASS

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. *Leonine Prayers.* It has been stated that these prayers are not of obligation when Mass is celebrated with any form of solemnity.

(a) Is this statement accurate?

(b) Does the Dialogue Mass (without singing) add the necessary form of solemnity, sufficient to justify the omission of the Leonine prayers?

(c) Does the Dialogue Mass with the addition of hymns or psalms in English add the necessary form of solemnity sufficient to justify the omission of the Leonine prayers?

2. Singing of hymns and/or psalms in the vernacular at Low Mass during the Judica psalm and the Last Gospel.

Guardini in *Meditations before Mass* (Newman Press, 1956, p. 201, Note 1), speaking of 'moments of stillness' during Low Mass says: 'the opening prayer at the foot of the altar should be prayed silently,' and 'the Last Gospel is similarly best read silently.' Others hold the same opinion.

In view of *Rubricae generales Missalis,* XVI, and *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae,* III, 4, 6, may the opinion be held so that hymns or psalms may be sung in the vernacular during the Judica and the Last Gospel at Low Mass?

S.L.

REPLY

1. Pius IX first prescribed the recitation of prayers after Mass in 1859. This applied only to the Papal States. The prayers prescribed were: three Aves, Salve Regina and four prayers. In 1884 Leo XIII extended the prayers to the universal Church, but substituted a single prayer for the four prescribed by his predecessor. Two years later, he changed this prayer to the form that we know. This alteration was not published in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis,* but a copy of the prayers was forwarded to all Bishops, with instructions to have them said after Low

Mass (missa privata). St. Pius X, in 1904, recommended the addition of the triple invocation of the Sacred Heart. The intentions were expressed in the prayers: 'the conversion of sinners and the liberty and exaltation of our holy Mother the Church.'

Following upon the Lateran Treaty, Pius XI directed that the prayers be offered for Russia (1930). The present Holy Father confirmed this intention in his Apostolic Letter to the people of Russia in 1952.

The prayers were prescribed after a low Mass and several subsequent decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites determined when they might even be omitted after a low Mass.

D. 3697 ad vii (7th December, 1888) stated that for the purposes of the Leonine prayers, a conventual Mass *sine cantu* is the equivalent of a solemn Mass.

D. 3805 (23rd June, 1893). To a question whether the prayers might be omitted after a low Mass in places where it was customary to recite certain prayers for the Dead after Mass, the answer was: No.

D. 3957 (28th May, 1897). Has the Parochial Mass, even when not sung, the character of a conventual Mass, so that the prayers after Mass *must* (*debeant*) be omitted? The reply: No.

D. 4271 ad ii (8th June, 1911). Must the prayers after Mass be omitted after the Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month, when this Mass is celebrated with the privileges of a solemn votive Mass *pro re gravi?* Such a Mass must be considered as a solemn Mass to which may be applied the rule given in D. 3697 ad vii.

D. 4305 (20th June, 1913). Taking account of the previous decrees concerning the conventual Mass (3697 ad vii) and the votive Mass of the Sacred Heart (4271 ad ii), may some similar low Mass (aliqua similis Missa lecta), e.g., on the occasion of a First Communion, or of a General Communion, of Confirmation (and Ordination), or a Nuptial Mass, be considered as a solemn Mass, and may we apply to it the rules of the above decree regarding the omission of the prayers after Mass ordered by the Pope? The Congregation replied: Yes, if the Mass is celebrated with some solemnity (si Missa cum aliqua solemnitate celebretur), or if the Mass is immediately and lawfully followed

by some sacred function or pious exercise, without the celebrant leaving the altar.[1]

To these decrees we may now add the rescript of the Congregation of Rites granted to the Archbishop of Bologna, Cardinal Lercaro, on 22nd July, 1955. The Cardinal had asked that, in view of the need to give the maximum amount of instruction without prolonging the Mass, the Leonine prayers might be omitted after a low Mass during which a homily had been preached. The request was granted [cfr. *A.C.R.*, xxxiii (1956), pp. 159-160].

The Directory for the Mass issued by the Archbishop of Malines, Cardinal van Roey, in September of last year states that the Leonine prayers are not obligatory after a dialogue Mass with vernacular hymns, nor after a dialogue Mass without hymns but during which a homily or sermon has been preached (*Autour de l'Autel du Seigneur*, p. 38 and 42).

In the light of the decisions of the Sacred Congregation commentators list a number of instances in which the Leonine prayers may certainly be omitted after low Mass. They may be omitted after a low Mass: i. if it is a conventual Mass or a funeral Mass; ii. if it is a votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month, or a votive Mass of Christ the High and Eternal Priest on the first Thursday or Saturday of the month, since both Masses enjoy the privileges of a Solemn Votive Mass when celebrated as part of the special devotions of those days; iii. if the Mass is celebrated according to the rite of the *Memoriale Rituum* on Candlemas Day, and Ash Wednesday, or on Maundy Thursday and the Easter Vigil according to the simple rite of the Restored Order of Holy Week; iv. if the Mass is celebrated with some degree of solemnity, such as on the occasion of a First Communion, a General Communion, Nuptial Mass, Confirmation or Ordination, or the "first" Mass of a newly-

---

[1]D. 4305. 'An, attentis S.R.C. decretis n. 3697, *Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum*, 7 Decembris 1888, ad VII, de missa conventuali sine cantu, et n. 4271, *Bajonen.*, 8 Junii 1911, ad II, de missa votiva lecta Ssmi. Cordis Jesu prima feria VI cujusvis mensis, etiam aliqua similis missa lecta, e.g., occasione primae communionis aut communionis generalis, sacrae confirmationis (vel ordinationis) aut pro sponsis, haberi possit uti solemnis, eique applicari valeant praefata decreta quoad preces in fine missae a Summo Pontifice praescriptas, omittendas? *Resp.* Affirmative, si Missa cum aliqua solemnitate celebratur, vel Missam, quin celebrans ab altari recedat, immediate ac rite subsequatur aliqua sacra functio seu pium exercitium.

ordained priest; v. if the Mass is lawfully and immediately followed by some sacred rite or pious exercise and the celebrant does not leave the sanctuary, e.g., absolution for the Dead, Benediction, prayers for the novena to the Holy Spirit before Pentecost, or the recitation of the Litany of Loreto during the October devotions.

On the score of the solemnity of the Mass most commentators add to the examples given above, n. iv, the Mass on the occasion of a Jubilee, or religious Reception and Profession.

Over the years there has been a good deal of discussion as to whether a parochial Mass with a sermon comes under the heading of a Mass celebrated with some solemnity as described in decree n. 4305. A commentary on this decree in the *Monitore Ecclesiastico* (in 1914) stated that a parochial Mass with a sermon came under the heading of a Mass celebrated with some solemnity. The *Ephemerides liturgicae* had said the same thing [xxvii (1913), pp. 725-726], and later on [xxxii (1918), pp. 276-278] considered the matter in reply to a suggestion that the interpretation of the *Monitore* 'nimia laxitate laborat.' The writer dismissed the charge of laxity, since no one will deny that a parochial Mass with sermon has some solemnity and consequently the prayers *may* be omitted after such a Mass, even though this is not necessary. This opinion was repeated in the same review at late as 1929 (pp. 121-123). However, a discussion of the question in 1931 (xlv. pp. 302-303) adopted a different attitude, by insisting that the *aliqua similis Missa lecta* of D. 4305 must be celebrated on some special occasion such as those mentioned in the decree. It concluded that this was not verified in the case of a parochial Mass with a sermon and even followed by Benediction, unless there was also a First Communion, &c. In 1941 (lv. pp. 59-60) Benediction is considered sufficient reason to omit the prayers if the celebrant does not leave the altar, but reference is made to the article of 1931 to exclude the parochial Mass (videtur certum responsum negativum).

The rescript granted to Cardinal Lercaro was published in the *Ephemerides* [lxx (1956), pp. 41-43], together with a commentary by Father C. Braga, C.M. Father Braga says that the terms of the rescript seem to indicate a new approach to the question, from the viewpoint of pastoral considerations. The need for instruction is great and the most opportune and practical way to meet this need is through the medium of the homily

during Mass on Sundays and feasts. The Holy Father stressed this very same point last year in his address to the Parish Priests of Rome and the Lenten preachers. Just as the prayers were originally added to the Mass because of the peculiar problems of that period, now that new needs have arisen in a new age the Church may well judge fit to adopt a different attitude in a matter such as this. Father Braga suggests that this change of mind has been indicated in the rescript, and he does not hesitate to express the wish to see it extended throughout the world.

Dom Maertens (*Paroisse et Liturgie*, 1956, p. 227) recognizes the particular application of the rescript obtained by Cardinal Lercaro, but he draws attention to the interpretation proposed in 1914 by *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico,* and asks whether it was really necessary for the Cardinal to have asked for an indult, since a parochial Mass with a sermon is a Mass celebrated 'cum aliqua solemnitate.' This certainly appears to have been the common teaching between 1913 and 1931, as is evident from the above references to the *Ephemerides liturgicae* likewise *L'Ami du Clerge* (1934, p. 382), *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* [xlii (1934), pp. 87-89], *Matters Liturgical* (2nd edit., 1929), n. 185 d. All of these sources subsequently changed to the more restricted interpretation as proposed in the *Ephemerides* in 1931, which understood D. 4305 to say that the solemnity was necessary but not sufficient of itself, it was further required that the Mass be celebrated on some special occasion; or alternatively, on some special occasion such as First Communion, &c., even though the Mass is not celebrated with any form of solemnity, the Leonine prayers may be omitted if the Mass is followed by some sacred rite or pious exercise and the celebrant does not leave the altar. Should we accept this view, it would seem to be more consistent to speak of the omission of the prayers after Masses on some special occasions, this is the first requisite, to which is added either the solemnity of the Mass or the rite after the Mass. The First Communion, or the Ordination does not of itself contain the essential degree of solemnity, it constitutes the special occasion. But commentators sometimes seem to confuse the issue by speaking simply of a Mass celebrated with some solemnity, v.g., Ordination, Nuptial Mass, or of a Mass followed by a pious exercise or rite, v.g., Benediction, for the justification of which they refer to D. 4305 and the interpretation given in the *Ephemerides* in 1931. May we not infer that these authors are basing their practical

conclusions on the earlier interpretation of the decree? It does seem a little strange that two prominent Roman periodicals amongst others should have supported a false interpretation for the first eighteen years after the decree was published. Perhaps the older view is not devoid of probability.

Let us now endeavour to answer the questions proposed.

(a) The statement that the Leonine prayers may be omitted 'when the Mass is celebrated with any form of solemnity' appears ambiguous for the reasons set out in the above discussion. The older opinion would admit it as it stands, but the majority of modern authorities should add that the statement is true only when the Mass is celebrated on some special occasion, v.g., First Communion, Nuptial Mass, &c. Some actually make the distinction, others do not.

(b) Is a dialogue Mass (without singing) to be counted a Mass celebrated with the necessary degree of solemnity? According to the common opinion the answer is in the negative [cfr. *Ephem. liturg.* lxii (1948), p. 292; *L'Ami du Clerge,* 1952, p. 336]. The Directory of Malines requires that a homily or sermon should have been delivered during the Mass (*op. cit.* p. 42).

(c) In the case of a dialogue Mass during which there are also English hymns or psalms, it seems that the Leonine prayers may be omitted because such a Mass presupposes, to some degree at least, a special occasion and it is celebrated with some solemnity. This is the solution proposed by the Malines Directory (*ibid.* p. 38).

In conclusion two observations may be made. The Leonine prayers were introduced by the positive legislation of the Church for a specific intention. Consequently, the Holy See alone has the right to determine when they may be omitted. Circumstances have changed, new problems have arisen, e.g., those outlined in the rescript granted to Cardinal Lercaro, and the Church has seemingly indicated her willingness to take account of this situation. Many favour the elimination of the prayers, but until such time as the Church declares her mind in a more explicit manner the substance of her previous instructions retain their binding force. Secondly, as Father Braga remarks (*loc. cit.*) when the prayers are omitted for sufficient reason, we would do well to remind the faithful of the petition of the Canon of the Mass: 'We offer them (i.e., these gifts) to thee, in the first

place, for thy holy catholic Church, deign to grant her peace and protection, to unite and govern her throughout the whole world. . . .'

2. Two points need discussion: the opportuneness of having something sung during the prayers at the foot of the altar or during the last Gospel at a low Mass, and how may this practice be reconciled with the prescriptions of the rubrics. We begin with the second point.

The *Rubricae generales* (XVI) state: 'In a low Mass (Missa privata) the following parts are to be said aloud: the antiphon and psalm at the entrance, the Confession with the following versicles and responses . . . and the last Gospel.' They further determine that 'the voice should not be so loud as to disturb others who may be celebrating in the church at the same time, nor so low that those present cannot hear' (*ibid.*). The *Ritus servandus* (III 4 & 6) repeats the same rule for the prayers at the foot of the altar. If we restrict our attention to the letter of the rubrics we are faced with a conflict between the rubrics and the proposed form for the participation of the faithful in the Mass.

The principle for the solution is enunciated by Pope Pius XII when he says: 'We also approve the efforts of those who want to make the liturgy a sacred action in which, externally also, all who are present may really take a part. There are several ways in which this may be done: The whole congregation, always conformably with the rubrics, may recite the responses in an orderly manner; they may sing chants corresponding to the various parts of the Mass; or they may do both' (*Mediator Dei.* ECTS. §111). The application of this principle has been made in the instructions issued by various Bishops for their respective dioceses regarding the use of dialogue Masses with or without hymns or psalms. The directions published by Cardinal Lercaro in his *A Messa Figlioli,* are doubly interesting since he mentions in the Preface of the 2nd Edition that the work has been revised by Archbishop Carinci, Secretary of the Congregation of Rites, and by Father Bugnini, C.M., a Consultor of the same Congregation. Father Bugnini has described the book as 'an excellent and safe guide for all' [*Ephem. liturg.* lxxi (1957). p. 124]. Amongst the practical norms laid down is that the celebrant should read the texts in a low voice whenever a lector is reading aloud in Italian or when the choir is singing. The

directions provide for the singing of an opening chant by the choir and people during the prayers at the foot of the altar and during the last Gospel. The approval of such methods of participation indicates that they do not involve a direct violation of the rubrics.

Fundamentally, the rite of the low Mass has been derived from the rite for private Masses and it has retained the characteristics of its origin even though it was the more common form of the public celebration of Mass when the present rubrics were promulgated by St. Pius V. The division of functions between celebrant, ministers, choir and people that we find in the public rite of the High Mass has been suppressed in the low Mass, in which everything is done by the celebrant and server. The development of the dialogue Mass has for its purpose to give the rite of the low Mass something of the public and social character that is of the very essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But, as is evident, we are now dealing with a form of the Mass that is not visualised by the rubrics of the Missal, hence with a situation that is *praeter legem.* In determining the forms of the dialogue Mass the rubrics of the High Mass will also be taken into account. There is no need to indulge in forced interpretations of rubrics, much less to cultivate a spirit of indifference to them, in order to reach a satisfactory solution.

Guardini very rightly draws attention to the importance of the periods of stillness in the Mass. Stillness is not merely the absence of speech or sound, it is something positive. 'Attentiveness—that is the clue to the stillness in question, the stillness before God.' In a dialogue Mass without any chants, stillness is the desirable attitude during the prayers at the foot of the altar and during the last Gospel. 'Strictly speaking, the prayer at the foot of the altar does not really belong to the Mass at all; it is the priest's personal preparation and formerly was prayed in the sacristy' (*loc. cit.*). Similarly, the last Gospel is not a didactic reading, but a devotional prayer. In a Pontifical Mass the Bishop still recites the last Gospel as he returns to the throne or sacristy. In a High Mass the celebrant recites the prayers at the foot of the altar privately with the sacred ministers; he reads the last Gospel privately. Following the norm of the High Mass, it is usually not recommended that the whole congregation should always recite the prayers at the

foot of the altar with the celebrant in a dialogue Mass, nor should the last Gospel be read aloud by a lector. However, in a High Mass the period of the prayers at the foot of the altar is not a time of stillness. During this time the Entrance antiphon, the Introit, is sung and this marks the beginning of the rite. For this reason an entrance hymn or psalm is appropriate, whereas the Confiteor in English is not wholly out of keeping with the spirit of this part of the Mass. As to the last Gospel, since the celebrant is still at the altar the assembly has not yet broken up, so a concluding chant or a summary of the thought of the last Gospel is generally recommended.

* * * * *

ADMONITION FROM THE HOLY OFFICE

In his encyclical on the Sacred Liturgy, the Holy Father wrote: 'It is therefore our duty, in all that has been done, to praise and approve what is right and to check and condemn what is wrong. But the lazy and indifferent must not think We are commending them when We restrain the over-venturesome and correct those who go astray; nor must the imprudent see praise for themselves in the reproof We administer to the negligent' (ECTS. §8). While insisting that the Church is a living organism whose liturgical worship develops and accommodates itself to the needs and conditions of the times, the Pope stated very clearly that the 'Sovereign Pontiff alone has the right to permit or establish any liturgical practice, to introduce or approve new rites, or to make changes in them he considers necessary' (*ibid.* §§62-63). On several occasions since 1947 His Holiness has repeated the same clear principles, but in spite of it all, there are apparently still some who presume to introduce changes, by way of addition or omission, in the public worship of the Church. In the *Official Documents* of this number of the *A.C.R.* (p. 181) our readers will have found a pronouncement of the Holy Office which calls attention to above principles and indicates that some are not adhering to them. We are not aware that any of the erroneous opinions and practices mentioned are being canvassed in this country, but a few words of comment may help us to understand the purport of the official memorandum.

The document speaks of the introduction of new or obsolete prayers, *precationes*, and scriptural readings into the liturgical

offices and even the Mass. The reference is to the restoration of a litany of prayers, similar to the Solemn Prayers (Oratio fidelium) of the liturgy of Good Friday. These would be inserted after the *Oremus* of the Offertory. The existence of the prayers in the Good Friday liturgy is indicative of their ancient origin, but as they are no longer contained in the liturgical books of the Roman Rite they may not be reintroduced by private initiative. As to the addition of lessons from Scripture, some it seems are endeavouring to follow the ancient plan of the readings by adding a third lesson from the Old Testament. Moreover, in rites for the administration of the Sacraments others are either recommending or adding readings from the Scriptures within the actual rites. These misguided efforts have not been restricted to additions, there have also been the deletions of certain texts. So they omit the prayers at the foot of the altar, the last Gospel, or the Confiteor before the Communion. Of course, we are well aware that these changes have been made in the Restored Order of Holy Week, but the changes were then made by the competent authority, the Holy See, not by private individuals.

Certain rites and ceremonies have been treated in a similar manner. The faithful have been directed to remain standing for the Elevation, both Host and Chalice have been elevated at the same time, or the final *Amen* of the Canon has been said during the "Little Elevation."

What are the motives that have led to these anomalies? An exaggerated regard for ancient prayers and rites. 'The liturgy of the early ages is worthy of veneration; but an ancient custom is not to be considered better, either in itself or in relation to later times and circumstances, just because it has the flavour of antiquity. . . . To go back in mind and heart to the sources of the sacred liturgy is wise and praiseworthy. The study of liturgical origins enables us to understand better the significance of festivals and the meaning of liturgical formulas and ceremonies. But the desire to restore everything indiscriminately to its ancient condition is neither wise nor praiseworthy' (*Mediator Dei.* 65-66). Another motive that has prompted these activities is the desire to promote the participation of the faithful in the sacred liturgy. But these alterations in the texts and rites tend rather to defeat their own purpose,

because the peculiar efficacy of the sacred liturgy belongs only to those rites contained in the liturgical books of the Church. When they are changed, they may well cease to be part of the public worship of the Mystical Body.

—P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

THERESE MARTIN, by Rosemary Haughton. London: Longmans. 1957 276 pp. 12/6A.

The author of this charming book is fortunate in being able to illustrate it herself. On nearly every page there is a line drawing of some episode in the life of St. Therese; the general effect is intimately touching. We recommend this biography to every school-girl library, and predict that it will always be on the lending list of spiritual books. At some boarding-schools there is a salutary custom of meditative reading done in the chapel before Mass. It is purely personal and optional; and the scatter of girls praying in the early morning before Mass seem to appreciate the silent communing with God. Many of them are from the second-year class—thoughtless enough during the day, one would say, but they are surely growing in spiritual stature in those early morning meditations. What better friend could they have with them than St. Therese of the Child Jesus?

In a postscript at the end of this book, the author said: "It took me two years to finish this book. Most of it was written in short snatches, between cooking and feeding babies and washing and ironing. Some of it I wrote with one hand while I held a fretful baby over my shoulder with the other. . . ." No matter. It is a brave little book.

—M.O.

Homiletics

THE SON OF GOD AMONG MEN

Attempts to present Christ on the stage or on the screen have rarely been successful. This, I think, is due not merely to a lack of good taste evident in many such productions, but also to a feeling of discomfort which we experience upon seeing Christ associated with simple human surroundings. We have been accustomed to think of Him primarily, and perhaps almost exclusively, as the Divine Person, so that we expect to hear a divine note in every syllable uttered by Him, and see a divine dignity in His every action. In so doing, surely, we are being unreasonable. The fact is that the Son of God mixed with the men of this human world of ours, shared its labours and anxieties, breathed its air, and fitted into its pattern of life. He descended from above, and belonged to another world, but none the less truly lived among men. If the Incarnation is not to remain merely a theological truth then we must endeavour to see Christ in this role, for the meaning of the Incarnation may be as easily lost by overlooking His humanity as by denying His divinity.

The evangelist who can help us most in this matter is St. Mark. His gospel is the shortest of the four, and contains little that is not paralleled in the other three. The leading theme of the gospel is the divinity of Christ, yet in no other gospel, perhaps, is His divine mission set against such a vivid human background. The result is a striking picture of the Son of God in His mission among men.

Mark begins his gospel by telling us that this is "the gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God" (1:1). There follows, in the first chapter, a gathering of witnesses, in which John the Baptist declares that he is not worthy "to stoop and loose the strap of his shoes," the Father acknowledges Him as "my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," and even an evil spirit recognises Him as "the holy one of God" (1:8, 11, 24). These testimonies underline from the outset the divinity of Christ which is to be Mark's central theme. They are supported, once again in the first chapter, by the account of three specific miracles and a reference

to an indefinite number (1:34). This also is characteristic of Mark's gospel. Despite its brevity, as compared with those of Matthew and Luke, it contains as many miracles as either of them. On the contrary, Mark avoids discourse to a great extent, introducing only occasionally a few words of Our Lord, which serve to confirm the impression of the miracles, rather than stand independently. Only in Chapter 13 is there one lengthy discourse comparable to those of Matthew. The narrative, consequently, moves quickly and is very factual in character. The continuous series of miracle accounts has the effect of bringing forward the divine power of Christ on every page, so that it is the ideal gospel from which to illustrate the divinity of Christ as shown by His miracles.

What impression did this Divine Person make upon those who met Him as He travelled around the villages of Galilee? St. Mark seems to have captured particularly well the atmosphere of enthusiasm and excitement which surrounded Him, especially in the early days of His ministry. Simon and the others had to announce that "All are seeking thee" (1:37), and soon it became necessary for Him "to remain without in desert places; and they came to Him from all sides" (1:45). When it was heard that He was in a certain house in Capharnaum soon "there was no room left even about the door" (2:2). Shortly afterwards the crowds were coming "from Judea, from Jerusalem, from Idumaea, from beyond Jordan, and from the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon. . . . And he bade his disciples keep a light boat in readiness for him because of the multitude, for fear they should crush him" (3:8-9). On two occasions it is mentioned that there was no time for meals (3:20; 6:31), and on the former it is added that His people came to take Him because "he is beside himself." The vast gatherings and enthusiastic scenes gave the impression of a person out of his mind. Throughout his story Mark is conscious of the masses who surged around his central character. Once again during the last week, for example, he succeeds better than the other evangelists in capturing the tense atmosphere which surrounded those crucial exchanges of question and answer. If it is the gospel of Christ's divinity, it is also the gospel of the divinity manifested among men. The theme is divine, the background is human.

The picture of Our Lord's environment would not be

nearly so striking were it not for the vivid style which Mark brings to his narratives. Although his gospel is by far the shortest of all, his account of single miracles is almost invariably the longest. In the cure of the paralytic, for example. Mark alone tells us of the four men who carried him, and he alone describes their ingenuity in stripping the tiles from the roof to lower him down (2:4). Then, in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, he informs us that she was both worse in health and poorer after consulting the physicians (5:26). He gives us a glimpse of her in her first realisation that she has been cured, and, alone of the evangelists, mentions the dramatic moment when Our Lord surveyed the crowd in search of the one who had, as it were, stolen power from Him: "And He looked around to see who had done this" (5:29-30). A few verses later there occurs another example of Mark's ability to single out the dramatic moment of an incident: "Talitha cum," He said to the daughter of Jairus. Mark wrote for gentiles and had to translate these words: "Maiden, I say to thee, arise." By recording the original he shows how he has appreciated the tension of that moment, as the solemn injunction rang out over the scornful sniggers of the mourners. These details, in which the narrative of Mark abounds by comparison with Matthew and Luke, are not merely useless padding. They are precisely the vivid details which give colour and vigour to any narrative, and make the incidents live again before our eyes.

But if Mark succeeds in bringing incidents to life before us, how much more successful he is with persons! He gives a distinctive personality to many of the individuals, who in Matthew and Luke appear without character or name. Scarcely anyone is passed over quite without comment. An outstanding example is Mark's description of the wretched demoniac of Gerasa: A man he was "who had his abode in the tombs. Even with a chain no one could bind him any more; for many times he had been bound with fetters and chains, and he had snapped the chains and broken into pieces the fetters, and no one was strong enough to master him. And continually, night and day, he was in the tombs and in the mountains, howling and cutting himself with stones" (5:3-5). This creature, barely human, the terror of the countryside, becomes the subject of the divine power: "And they come unto Jesus, and they behold the possessed—the man who had had the legion—seated, clothed

and in his right mind." Not satisfied with such a graphic account, Mark concludes by telling us of this man's gratitude and goodwill: "And as he was embarking in the boat, the man that had been possessed besought him that he might be with him. And he suffered him not, but he saith to him, 'Go thou home unto thine own, and tell them of all that the Lord hath done for thee, and how he took pity on thee" (v. 18-19).

This is not an isolated instance: the father of the possessed boy is described in terms no less touching: " 'From childhood, and often it hath cast him into fire and into water to destroy him. But if thou canst do aught take pity on us and help us.' And Jesus said to him, 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.' Straightway the father of the boy cried out saying, 'I do believe; help thou my unbelief' " (9:22-24). This account of the distressed father indicates very clearly the human interest and sympathy which Mark brings even to his secondary characters, for, after all, the father was not to be the subject of the cure. Another example is found in the account of the beggar by the Jericho road (10:46-52). Mark alone supplies us with his name of Bartimaeus. Apparently he was a familiar figure in the place and won little sympathy from the passing crowd by his cries. But he realised that this could be the day of his enlightening, and continued to cry out. Then there occurs what he had scarcely dared to expect: he is told that Jesus is calling him: "And casting off his cloak he leaped up and came to Jesus." In these few words Mark has expressed the elation of Bartimaeus as a new era of light opened up before him.

Even a passing comment is at times sufficient to describe some personality. Another blind man's sentiments are recorded at that moment when darkness is changing into light: "I see men; I see them as though they were trees, but walking about" (8:24). Even Zebedee has his moment, appearing as a somewhat desolate figure, watching his sons follow Jesus, while he is left in his boat with hired men (1:20).

One fact which emerges very clearly is that in Mark's gospel we certainly have an eye-witness account of the events narrated; otherwise many details are entirely inexplicable. According to tradition, however, Mark himself was not the eye-witness, but recorded in writing the preaching of Peter. The unanimity of the early Fathers on this point is extraordinary: scarcely one writer

mentions the Gospel of St. Mark without at the same time mentioning its dependence on Peter, and Justin the Martyr, writing in the second half of the second century, referred to it simply as "The Memoirs of Peter." The brief study of the gospel just made confirms that fact.

Of all the apostles, we know Peter best. The Gospels, Acts and Epistles, reveal to us the practical, realistic type of working man one would expect to find in a fishing business on the shores of the lake. He shows himself, moreover, very human, a man of strong conviction, but not an intellectual. Such a man would be expected to produce just such a gospel as we have seen. He would have been most impressed by what he saw. While Matthew, the educated publican, was absorbing Our Lord's every word in the Sermon on the Mount, Peter was probably watching the reactions of the hearers. As a man of visual mind he observed and retained the most intimate details of particular events: the terrifying figure of the demoniac of Gerasa, the four men removing the tiles to lower the paralytic, poor Bartimaeus and his cries, even the appearance of Zebedee as he stood among his hired men. There are several other facts which confirm the tradition. The Gospel according to St. Mark is surprisingly silent on Peter's privileges; it makes very frequent mention of the Sea of Galilee during the Galilean ministry (sixteen times in nine chapters) as if the whole of Our Lord's activity is being viewed from that point.

As Peter preached in Rome, many years later, these details came to his lips, and no doubt he held the early Christians enthralled as he outlined for them the life and the works of the Son of God here on earth. And, thanks to the fidelity of St. Mark, we may take up those accounts to-day, and learn from them a better understanding and a greater love of the Son of God Incarnate.

B. HEATHER.

St. Columba's College, Springwood.

Notes

MARY McKILLOP: A NEW BIOGRAPHY

The best advice this note can offer about Father Osmund Thorpe's *Mary McKillop* is that you read it.[1] In 1916, a Sister of St. Joseph gave us the unpretentious but valuable *Life and Letters* and some ten years later Father G. O'Neill, S.J., dealt exhaustively with both Father Tenison Woods and Mother Mary of the Cross. But even though you may have read all these you will be gratified that you have read the latest work.

At the time of her death, Cardinal Moran, who knew her personally over many years, and was fully informed on the whole life just ended, granted her the accolade; fifty years later, Cardinal Gilroy—witness to wonderful works of God wrought through her agency in the interval—adopts and approves Father Thorpe's verdict: "Australia's greatest daughter."

The author must have been well repaid for his labour on Mother Mary's behalf when he first read the "few words of cordial send-off" with which Cardinal Gilroy honoured him. Those few words are not so much a foreword as a review that any Catholic biographer would covet.

In genuine humility, Father Osmund voices his fear that his work may not be readable enough and that he may not have brought Mother Mary's personality into the foreground. The writer would like to reassure him and his readers on these points; for the matter and its presentation keep strong hold on the imagination, and Mary McKillop definitely grips the attention through long years of sowing and reaping from her arrival at Penola until she returned to her Master with joyfulness, carrying her sheaves.

Even in the flash-back over the first twenty-four years of her life while we are admitted to the McKillop's family intimacies, Mary Helen appears as the child of promise. Almost at the hour

---

[1]Mary McKillop: Mother Mary of the Cross, Foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Sacred Heart, by Osmund Thorpe, C.P. London, 1957. Burns, Oates. 25/-

of her birth, the Vicar-Apostolic of New Holland was at the feet of the Holy Father pleading for the establishment of an Australian hierarchy, of which the earliest constituent was a See of Adelaide—destined to be the nursery of an Institute, native to Australia, but an ornament to the universal Church.

If a critic could pick any quarrel with the author, it would not be over Mary's foreground position, but over his neglect of a dramatic background which could throw her into far bolder relief.

He opens his narrative pleasantly in the year 1866; and his word picture makes the time and scene seem very near and cleanly etched though nearly a century distant. Yet it would not have been out of place to draw attention to an extraordinary coincidence.

The stable at Penola closely copied the humility of Bethlehem: in the continent of Australia it was as unknown as Bethlehem was to the world. Yet *there* was begun a work of fashioning the Mystical Body in the field of education unique in the world and beyond estimation even in retrospect: and for the future, who can foretell? And here is the coincidence: the Foundress began that little school at the end of November, 1866, and in December of that year, Henry Parkes brought down his Bill "To make better provision for Public Education."

This piece of legislation originated in the Mother colony, but was to form the pattern of Education in the other colonies as well. It was a distinct advance towards secularisation—a prelude to what would follow in the 'eighties. A Catholic system was already functioning, in the circumstances creditable, but vulnerable. Cardinal Moran sums up pithily: "The Colonial Secretary (Parkes), on his part, made no secret of his hostility to the denominational and in particular to the Catholic schools. A favourite statement of his was to the effect that the position taken by the Catholics was not one of principle but of caprice and fashion and selfishness, and would prove to be only short-lived, spasmodic demonstration. . . . In the first four years of this new system certificates were withdrawn from fifteen Catholic schools . . . and, in 1870, there were ten other Catholic schools under official notice that the certificate would be withdrawn. One of the arts to which the Council (of Education) had recourse to

encompass its purpose was to appoint its best teachers to those public schools that came into competition with the denominational schools. . . . The Council, in its report of the year 1870, went so far as to say that 'predilection for denominational schools was weak in the Sydney district;' and that 'denominational schools, as such, do not really exist'."

The Protestant bodies were vanquished in the battle, but Catholics grimly maintained the fight. It was in these years that Mother Mary was building up battalions; and we dare to apply to her what our Breviary says of St. Brigid: "Cuius postea exemplo tanta puellarum multitudo illud regularis vitae institutum amplexata est, ut brevi tempore universam Hiberniam coenobiis virginum repleret." On points of law sometime friends and even Bishops literally drove Mary and her Sisters to Sydney, where the education battle was raging most fiercely, and whence the Bishops of the Province had sounded the clarion: "this expenditure on godless education, this studding the colony with schools which the Church knows from experience will, in course of time, fill the country with indifferentists, not to speak of absolute infidels; this use of Catholic funds—of taxes paid out of Catholic pockets—for establishing a system of education throughout the land, which not merely Catholics cannot safely make use of, but which they firmly believe is calculated to sap the foundations of Christianity; is an act so galling to every feeling of fair-play, that we do not see how any free man, with any spirit in him, can allow it to pass unchallenged."

That Pastoral issued in June, 1879, and the storm that broke was unparalleled in violence; it was in the heat of it that one politician unblushingly asserted that the worst cargo of convicts that ever landed at Port Jackson was less detrimental to the colony than the arrival of Archbishop Vaughan: and Parkes prophesied that his education Bill would mean death to the calling of the priesthood of the Church of Rome: vitriol dripped from innumerable pens: and the Catholic religion was stigmatized as a "blasphemous travesty of the Christian religion." Yet, into that storm the Sisters of St. Joseph fled as to a haven before the end of the year. They were already entrenched and ready to carry out the new Catholic education programme that was to rise out of the challenge accepted.

Bishop O'Reilly, then of Port Augusta, wrote some years

later: "Your forced retreat from South Australia was but the means adopted by Almighty God to give the Institute a stronger hold upon Australia, and to bring it, through contact with the Head of the premier See of the country, into closer contact with the Holy Father himself."

The incidents recalled and their fortunate timing may be merely coincidences: or, perhaps, they were part of God's plan. In any case, they still show Mother Mary in the forefront, yet do not violate any historical canon.

Maybe these ideas will stimulate the learned author when he is preparing a new edition, say, in the Epilogue, to point out to the general reader God's blessing on the Catholic education system and Mary McKillop's growth in personal sanctity in parallel.

J. J. McGOVERN.

St. Patrick's Presbytery, Parramatta, N.S.W.

THE FERRY

Lady Emily Lutyens's *Candles in the Sun* (London, 1957) was a great surprise to me, as I had read her earlier book, *A Blessed Girl: Memoirs of a Victorian Girlhood. Chronicled in an Exchange of Letters,* 1887-1896 (London, 1953), which had not prepared me for *Candles in the Sun.* Her first book with its deliberate Victorian title was a record of the letters exchanged between Emily Lytton, grand-daughter of the novelist, Bulwer Lytton, and the Rev. Whitwell Elwin, a Norfolk clergyman of literary distinction. Elwin was fifty-eight years older than Emily, who was thirteen when the exchange of letters began. The Lyttons were great names in literary, political, sporting and Etonian circles at the end of the Victorian age. Now these letters are of extreme interest for lovers of that age with all kinds of pictures of bygone society. For instance, the young girl describes Elwin at breakfast: "On Communion Sundays his Rev. would cut the bread into small squares, some for the communicants and some for his canaries." The young girl, too, had the most vehement views on all manner of subjects, for example, treating of Henry Irving's acting as beneath contempt, which was the view of the rising dramatic critic, Bernard Shaw. Shaw had had experience; Emily Lytton had had none. "His Rev.,"

however, did not rebuke the precocious girl; indeed, his interest in her letters was no doubt bad training for Emily Lytton. She married Edwin Lutyens in 1898. Lutyens was a brilliant, young architect, whose great work at New Delhi, the Cenotaph at London, and in the design for the new Liverpool Catholic Cathedral was to make him one of the famous men in his profession. Poor old Elwin died shortly after the marriage, which he had advised Emily to enter into, even though Lutyens was then struggling to make his way. You always wonder when a novel, or, such a revealing collection of letters, ends, what happened afterwards? *Candles in the Sun* answered my curiosity.

Years ago there was a part of Sydney, whose inhabitants lived in opulent mansions, supported and adorned by profits derived from the Sydney Ferry Company, helped by a few coal mines. All the men caught one of their ferries into the city each morning. One was a mine owner, a Scot, who had the reputation of making more Communists in a day than any other employer in N.S.W.; another was a jeweller, a Mr. Flavelle, whose name (or surely his father's name) was mentioned in *Robbery Under Arms,* which made him especially romantic in youthful eyes; a third was a retired bookmaker, of great fame, whose family had preserved his last big win, and left him the time to contemplate his fellow-travellers with a jaundiced eye, as he was most aggressive and extremely patriotic, forever comparing the ancient mine owners and share-holders around him with the boys at Gallipoli. He was a Catholic, and, incidentally, a powerful force when the *Ne Temere* troubles almost sunk the ferry. There were others—but if more is said, the place and names might be identified. But on the boat, too, there were outsiders, an arty-crafty crowd of eccentrics, the Theosophists.

They lived as the guests of a Scottish couple in their vast home. The husband was a dried-up, little Scot, whose peculiar religion was the amused despair of the mine owner, his fellow-countryman. The wife was a jolly, fat woman, liked by everybody. And now it turns out that Lady Emily Lutyens travelled on the old boat, as *Candles in the Sun* is the story of her long devotion to the cause of Theosophy.

A sentence in *The Blessed Girl* should have provided the key: "As far back as I can remember, I was always a very religious child, of a devotional type. I had a passionate love for Christ, and

a firm belief that I should live to witness His second coming." The married life of Emily Lytton was a disappointment. Her husband did not care to attend church, which his young wife did; he desired her, as a sensible wife, to entertain his friends and clients, which was an impossibility for her. Lutyens was extremely kind, and must have been one of the most long-suffering husbands in England. Absorbed in his own work, he allowed his wife to wrestle alone with her spiritual unhappiness. A chance remark of his that one of his clients was a Theosophist fired her imagination; she began to read Mrs. Annie Besant's *London Lectures of* 1907. This remarkable woman (whom we saw on the ferry, and twice on Sundays) had been married to the Rev. Frank Besant of Sibsey. "Annie Besant's life was so remarkable in several respects," writes that venerable anti-Papist, anti-Irish writer, St. John Ervine, in his *Bernard Shaw* (1956), "that she is now a legendary figure. Almost entirely Irish in origin, with only enough English blood in her veins to preserve her sanity, she had a mixed ancestry." She quickly became bored with the Rev. Frank Besant, who was, according to St. John Ervine, a cheerless curate, a dreary curate, who married above himself intellectually. One day when the church was empty, Mrs. Besant got up into the pulpit and began to preach. She found that she was a born preacher. St. John Ervine who heard her lecture when she was an old woman was deeply impressed by the "flaming fire of eloquent words that seemed as if they must consume every man and woman who heard her." She never stopped preaching. After divorcing the dreary curate, she aided Charles Bradlaugh in his propaganda for contraceptives, which landed them both into the courts; she was an early Fabian, and served as a model for the character, Mrs. Clandon, in Bernard Shaw's play *You Never Can Tell;* she succeeded Mme. Blavatsky as head of the Theosophists.[1] Emily Lutyens was a valuable contact for the Theosophists, as the Lytton clan had connections everywhere. Lady Lutyens had found an interest, an absorbing interest. She, too, became a lecturer, and to the present day confesses she would rather give a lecture than attend a dinner-party.

---

[1]*The Dictionary of National Biography* (1931-40) *S.V.* gives a valuable account of Annie Besant's political work in India. It speaks of her facile but somewhat shallow eloquence.

Theosophy, she says, proclaims the existence of men made perfect, who having learnt all that may be known in a physical body, are liberated from "karma"—that inexorable law of cause and effect through a series of lives. "These Elder Brethren constitute the Occult Hierarchy who form the inner government of the world. At their head is a Trinity consisting of the King or Lord of the World, the Lord Buddha, and the Mahachohan." The orders of this Trinity are given to the world by the Manu and the Bodhisattva. The Lord Maitreya is the present holder of the latter office, and it was he who took possession of the body of Jesus. Under these great ones, there were lesser members, especially the protectors of the Theosophical Society, the Master Morya, the Master Koot Hoomi (known more familiarly as the Master M. and the Master K. H.), and the Master the Count. They were called "Master," because it was the hope of all Theosophists to be adopted by these great teachers. The Masters were said to have physical bodies, so that Mme. Blavatsky claimed to have stayed with the Master M. in Tibet, "and C. W. Leadbeater, a prominent member of the T.S., maintained that he had once met the Count in his physical body quite by chance in the Corso in Rome." After a period of probation, the novice began, under the direction of a Master, his preparation for Initiation. "There are altogether Five Initiations in the physical body, and after passing the Fifth a man is liberated from the laws of karma and the wheel of life and death, and may pass into the super-human world, unless he deliberately chooses to remain tied to our world in order to help humanity, as in the case of the Masters. Mrs. Besant, we were told, and C. W. Leadbeater, had already taken their Fourth Initiation." Such was the body to which Lady Lutyens had given her faith.

In these outbursts of peculiar religions, there always appears to be an element of haste. Joseph Smith had his dream and at once in the woods found the Book of Mormon; so too the Theosophists thought that the Lord Maitreya would re-appear in the world; in 1909, C. W. Leadbeater "on his way down to the sea through the palm groves of Adyar, saw a group of Indian boys, among them two of the sons of Jiddu Naraniah, a high-caste Telegu Brahmin . . . who . . . [was] a member of the T.S." C. W. Leadbeater seems to have noticed something remarkable about the auras (i.e., a multi-coloured emanation surrounding a person which is visible to clairvoyance) of the boys, one of

whom was Krishnamurti, who was born near Madras in 1895. After further examination C. W. Leadbeater decided that in Krishna's body the Lord Maitreya would come. The Theosophical Society had taken up a fixed position. Krishna became C. W. Leadbeater's pupil and was brought to London in 1911. His father sought to have his son returned to his custody; Mrs. Besant alleged that Krishna's father was acting from political motives; he alleged that C. W. Leadbeater was an immoral man. After long and unhappy law suits, the Theosophists retained possession of the young man. Probably it was this publicity that prompted C. W. Leadbeater to transfer his headquarters to Sydney. C. W. Leadbeater's early life, Lady Lutyens says, was obscure. He was born in Northumberland and seemingly had been an Anglican curate. Lady Lutyens had met him in Italy, and her first impressions were bad, but his conversation and claims won her to a more benign judgment.

The little body of Theosophists now moved between Sydney, Adyar, England and the Continent. Lutyens was becoming alarmed at his wife's and his children's long absence in India and Australia, but his wife wrote to him that he must be patient, for she said, disarmingly, that she was odd and always would be odd. What kept her faithful to the cause was Krishna. Very frankly she tells us of the influence in her life of this quiet Indian youth, who persistently failed in all examinations at the London University. It is evident that Mrs. Besant and C. W. Leadbeater began to worry if her feelings for Krishna were purely maternal; one thing is certain, Lady Lutyens was deeply impressed by the spiritual qualities of the Indian, though she saw "there was a very different side to the dreamy, clairvoyant, spiritually-minded boy, earnest in the Master's service. Both he and Nitya [Krishna's brother, who died in early manhood] were full of fun. They loved cinemas and theatres, and were both passionately interested in motor cars."

Mrs. Besant in her old age was much under the influence of George Arundale and J. I. Wedgwood. C. W. Leadbeater had settled in Sydney in 1913, but through his psychic powers he alleged he knew what was happening on the other side of the world. A question may be answered now, where were the funds coming from for all this coming and going, newspapers, books, radio station, buildings and so on? Generous supporters housed

them; moreover, a Miss Dodge, a wealthy American living in England, backed the Society in a munificent fashion. Further developments and complications came in 1916. C. W. Leadbeater was consecrated a bishop—he was the Regionary Bishop for Australasia—by Wedgwood, and the Liberal Catholic Church was set up in Sydney.[2] Bishop Leadbeater now caught the ferry. And it was a memorable day when it reached the Quay with Bishop Leadbeater and the Regionary Bishop of America, a sad looking man with a thin red beard, whose name was Cooper, on aboard. The thin Scotsman and his jolly, fat wife (and the wits of the boat marvelled how she retained her weight on the vegetarian diet, which made "John," the local Chinaman, a very wealthy man) now had some fifty people staying at their house, of all sorts, sizes and colours. They all looked extremely sad, and the saddest of all was Bishop Cooper, whose name figures in Lady Lutyens's book. The great Coming was in the air; a notorious building was erected at Balmoral; a new residence was found for the colony—the Manor at Mosman. We had lost our star attraction. Moreover, they were building the Bridge, so down went the shares of the Sydney Ferry Company. All the old gentlemen were of the same age, and scenting the depression, they went to their God in a most respectable manner. Their great mansions have fallen into the hands of convents, hospitals and flat builders.

The movement was now most complicated. There was Krishna and the Coming; the Liberal Catholic Church was appealing more and more to Bishop Leadbeater; every week Masonic meetings were being held. The chiefs, Mrs. Besant and

---

[2]Dr. Rumble in an interesting article in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (March, 1958, pp. 559-571) deals with the history of the Liberal Catholic Church. He concludes: "As a religion, Liberal Catholicism cannot be regarded as Christian. . . . Neither the Catholic Faith, nor genuine Catholic worship, nor the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, are to be found in the so-called "Liberal Catholic Church." Dr. Rumble, likewise, made enquiries at Rome, and was informed officially, that neither the Holy Office nor the Congregation of Rites had ever pronounced any decision in regard to the validity of Orders conferred by the Liberal Catholic Church. The source of the Orders of the Liberal Catholics is to be found in A. H. Mathew, who was a Catholic priest before passing over to Anglicanism. He was consecrated a bishop by three Dutch 'Old Catholic' bishops. Mathew consecrated F. S. Willoughby, who in turn consecrated Wedgwood. Mathew seemingly repented, but never made his submission to the Catholic Church. Lady Lutyens is inaccurate when she speaks of Mathew's return to the R.C. Church.

Bishop Leadbeater, were now approaching venerable years, so it was not surprising that younger people, such as Wedgwood and Arundale, tried to stake out their claims for future power. They acted on Mrs. Besant, at a meeting in Holland in 1925, and tremendous events followed. George Arundale "brought through" the names of ten of the Twelve Apostles whom the Lord had chosen to work with Him when He came, including, of course, the names of Mrs. Besant, Leadbeater, Lady Lutyens and of the other leaders. Mrs. Besant, then, announced that she, Leadbeater, Krishna, Wedgwood and Arundale had all taken their Fifth and final Initiation, i.e., they were free now to pass into the other world. Following this astonishing news, Mrs. Besant and the new Masters went off to visit the Master the Count, who lived in Hungary. After a week or two, the party returned silent and dejected. They had failed to find the Master the Count. In Sydney, Bishop Leadbeater became alarmed at what he regarded as nonsense. A further crisis came when Krishna felt that the Lord had come upon him, but his message was that the Theosophical Society, Liberal Catholic Church and the esoteric branch must all disappear. "I maintain," he said, "that truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whosoever, by any religion, by any sect. . . . I do not want followers." Mrs. Besant accepted Krishna's declaration; Bishop Leadbeater said that the "Coming had gone wrong." The Theosophists were fatally divided. "It is not easy to understand C.W.L.'s [i.e., Leadbeater's] change of front," Lady Lutyens writes, "but I think the reason for it was that there was no longer any place for him or for the other T.S. leaders in Krishna's teaching." On the other side, Mrs. Besant was said to be senile.

In 1930, Lady Lutyens spoke her farewell piece to a body which she had followed for twenty years. She had listened and believed Bishop Leadbeater telling her one sunny day at Taronga Park that a rock at National Park loved one of the Theosophist boys to sit on it; she had become a Liberal Catholic; she was a 30th Degree Mason; she had been told by Bishop Leadbeater that her daughters had been her mother at various stages of her reincarnations. But she had longed for the World Teacher. Now it was the end. Annie Besant died in 1933; to be followed to the

grave a year later by Charles Webster Leadbeater, who died in Sydney.[3]

Candles in the Sun is a terrifying book to read as there but for the grace of God many might have sought comfort and peace.

Numerous high tides have swept around the rocks of Fort Denison since those days, splashing against the sides of the ferry, which to those who knew it will always carry its mixed cargo to their various destinies.[4]

T. VEECH.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

---

[3]Dr. Rumble in the article cited above and Lady Lutyens give the details of the charges of immorality made against Leadbeater. Dr. Rumble writes that Leadbeater "Under Madame Blavatsky's tuition . . . developed his rather remarkable psychic faculties. . . ." He paid great attention to the cleanness of hands and feet, "as through these," Lady Lutyens says, "the magnetism of the body flows out." A last memory of Bishop Leadbeater is of his imposing presence uninvited at the Corpus Christi procession at Manly, to the indignation of the authorities. Malicious people wondered what he made of the aura of a certain local "master!"

[4]It is only fair to quote Lady Lutyens's final words about Krishna: "For me he will always remain unique—the purest and most beautiful being I have ever come across, the perfect flower of humanity." How sad is life if the pupil of 'his Rev.' can forget One who was the Way, the Truth and the Life!

SHORT NOTICE

THE COMMONWEAL TREASURY, ed. by Edward S. Skillin. The Commonweal Publishing Co. Inc., New York. n.d. 128pp. 1 dollar.

This is a sample-bag from one of America's foremost weekly reviews. Skilfully chosen by Edward Skillin, for years the financial backer of the review, these articles set off the twin poles of ***The Commonweal.*** Firstly, it is liberal, showing a concern for civil rights and the protection of democratic processes—here are articles on Negroes, the poor, the persecuted, anti-semitism; secondly, it is Catholic, applying eternal norms to the exigencies of modern life—rethinking, for example, the theory of religious freedom in a Catholic State. Without trying to allot honours to the galaxy of wriers (Bernanos, Berdyaev, Stern, Reinhold are some of them), it must be said that Maritain's essay, "That Suffer Persecution . . ." has been reckoned amongst his finest writings and should not be missed by any of his disciples. The anthology is an attractive sampling of Christianity in the market-place freed from that jejune moralism which often mars Catholic journalism.

—E.C.

Book Reviews

THE LIFE OF ST. LOUIS. By John of Joinville. "The Makers of Christendom" Series. Sheed and Ward, 1955. 306 pp. 18/-

The Life of St. Louis by Joinville, one of his officers and counsellors, has the best qualities of the mediaeval chronicles: a power of simple narrative, a mixture of naivete and shrewdness in assessing character and incident, a strong sense of individuality in the author, the sudden lighting up in a phrase or sentence of contrasts between the Middle Ages and our own day.

Joinville is very much the old soldier when he writes, and inclined to lament modern softness. He boasted his loyalty to his king, but it was a feudal loyalty with recognised limits, and he threatened to leave Louis' service over an affront to a knight of his division by a mere foot-soldier. Foot-soldiers were bad enough, but the poor—! The king asked me whether I washed the feet of the poor on Maundy Thursday. "God forbid, sir!" I answered. "No, I will not wash the feet of those brutes!" "In truth," he said, "that was a poor answer. . . ."

In his description of Louis' sanctity he is quite frank about the level of his own. The king asked him in the presence of some friars whether he would rather be a leper or have committed a mortal sin. I could never tell him a lie, and I answered that I would rather commit thirty mortal sins than become a leper. After the friars had gone he called me by myself and made me sit at his feet and said, "How was it that you gave me that answer yesterday?" When I told him that I was still of the same mind, he said to me, "That is a wild and foolish way of speaking. . . ."

Most of the book is taken up with the Crusade that nearly succeeded. The preparations and sailing, the raids and great battles, the rivalries in Louis' armies and the prowess of his great captains, the defeat and imprisonment of Louis and the negotiations for his release, are described by one who took part in them and who could write strongly of what he saw. There is intense pathos in Joinville's unadorned account of the great failure.

St. Louis' attitude to the Saracens may be gauged from his disapproval of laymen's engaging in debate with unbelievers: that was for the clergy. "A layman, as soon as he hears the Christian faith maligned should defend it only by the sword, with a good thrust in the belly, as far as the sword will go." Could anything have been regarded as more Christian by the world of 1250, or as more un-Christian by 1958?

There are a useful introduction and a map. The excellent Notes, after the modern fashion, are made as inaccessible as possible, in the back of the book.

—V.M.

LOVE ONE ANOTHER, by L. Colin, C.SS.R. Mercier Press, 1957, 178 pp., 15/- stg.

Although written by a Religious for religious, this book is a searching study of Christian charity whether in the cloister, the commerce of friendship or the Christian family. Preachers and teachers will find it a source book for a subject that should be stressed continually in our instructions to adults or children. The world will be saved by love not by "summit" talks. The duty of supernatural charity should be taught in the class-room: it is horrifying to come across nourished animosities among young people who seem not at all troubled by their sins against charity, though other sins lie heavy on their conscience. They need a little more idealism along the lines of St. Francis of Assisi with his cry of charity: "Where there is hatred let me sow love. . . ." These are the thoughts that came to a reviewer during a reading of Father Colin's useful book.

The translation by Fergus Murphy seems an adequate rendering of the original French, though many chapters consist of disjointed observations, all of which, however, are worth pondering. The book is meant for meditative and private reading rather than to be read as a continuous theme. In other words it is packed with thought. An example of this thoughtfulness, set forth in defective style, each sentence being allowed to stand as a paragraph, is: "Our generosity should extend to the forgetfulness of favours we have bestowed. The charity which burns in our hearts is a free gift from God; let us expend it freely on our brethren. . . ." Such patches occur too frequently. And, now, while we are being censorious, permit us to remark that the print is too small. Still, we would not like to put readers off an excellent book.

When reading Father Colin's other books we have often wondered how he meets the unique specimens of religious life—or does he have some chatty penitents? Wherever he finds his anecdotes they are unexpected and amusing—evidently, French vintage. There is the Superior who says to one of his young religious: "Will you allow me to pass a little remark to you?" To which the religious replies: "What, *again?*" We presume that this gallic retort was the last one he made before packing his bags.

—M.O.

* * * * *

LUNACY AND LETTERS, by G. K. Chesterton. Sheed and Ward, London and New York. 1958. 192pp. 12/6 (English).

Thirty-eight essays, from contributions to the *Daily Mail* in the years 1901 to 1911, now appear in book form for the first time (edited by Dorothy Collins). The political articles of the day are excluded, the discussion being confined to subjects of a permanent value: The Poetry of Cities, The Meaning of Dreams,

A Defence of Bores, The Paradox of Humility, The Orthodoxy of Hamlet, Contradicting Thackeray, &c. The papers belong to the period of similar collections, such as *Tremendous Trifles*. "At this time," Chesterton wrote, "I had little more than a desire to be just to the Catholic theory of Christianity. I had not yet discovered the fact that a man cannot be just to the Catholic idea. The moment he begins to be just to it, he begins to like it." G.K.C.'s literary essays are all worth while for matter as for manner. Full of wisdom, originality and brilliance, they are presented simply in an eminently bright and entertaining style. Here are the opening sentences of "History Versus the Historians": "In my innocent and ardent youth I had a fixed fancy. I held that children in a school ought to be taught history, and ought to be taught nothing else. The story of human society is the only fundamental framework outside of religion in which everything can fall into place. A boy cannot see the importance of Latin simply by learning Latin. Nobody can possibly see any sense in learning geography or in learning arithmetic—both studies are obviously nonsense. But on the eager eve of Austerlitz, where Napoleon was fighting a superior force in a foreign country, one might see the need for Napoleon knowing a little geoghraphy and a little arithmetic. I have thought that if people would only learn history, they would learn to learn everything else. . . .

"Since that age of innocence I have, however, realised that there is a difficulty in this teaching of history. And the difficulty is that there is no history to teach. This is not a scrap of cynicism —it is a genuine and necessary product of the many points of view and the strong mental separations of our society, for in our age every man has a cosmos of his own, and is therefore horribly alone. There is no history; there are only historians. . . ."

—C.S.D.

* * * * *

THE SOUL OF THE APOSTOLATE: Dom Chautard, O.C.R. Authorised translation by Rev. J. A. Moran, S.M. Revised edition, 1957; Burns and Oates, London; M. H. Gill and Son Ltd., Dublin; pp. xv. + 230; paper, 8/6.

The bedside book of Pope St. Pius X, the book which has been the guide of many over the past fifty years, scarcely needs introduction and commendation from this reviewer. All users of the work will welcome this revised edition printed in Dublin, which eliminates the abundant typographical errors of the earlier English editions. Many changes in the wording have also been made though one or two awkward and obscure sentences remain. In addition, slightly larger and heavier type combined with good format make the book pleasing to use.

For those who have not yet met the work of Dom Chautard, a few words on the content may be of value. The book is divided into five parts:

Good works and the interior Life are the will of God;

The Union of the active Life and the interior Life; the active Life is full of danger unless united with the interior Life and with progress in virtue;

Rich results of the ministry through the interior Life;

Some principles and counsels for the interior Life.

This last section contains practical hints for those engaged in the active apostolate, notes on Mental Prayer, the Liturgy, custody of the heart and devotion to Mary. The keynote of the book is practicality—solid doctrine and application of principle to practice. It is a book not merely to be read, but to be used.

P.F.M.

* * * * *

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION "CHRISTUS DOMINUS": Text, translation and commentary, with short annotations on the Motu Proprio *Sacram Communionem*: Rev. James Ruddy, J.C.L.; Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1957; 2 dollars; x + 141.

Father Ruddy set out to "endeavour to contribute to a uniformity of practice in the application of the principles as set down in the new legislation," i.e. in *Christus Dominus*. Since *Sacram Communionem* which came out before the completion of the original study (noted by the author in a footnote), has completely abrogated the laws of *Christus Dominus*, 113 pages out of 141 of Father Ruddy's work now has little more than academic interest. However, in this first part there are useful sections on the History of the Eucharistic Legislation and on General Juridical Norms, i.e. the notion of "grave incommodum," confessor, natural water, liquid, medicine and the use of alcohol.

The brief Appendix of nineteen pages on the Motu Proprio *Sacram Communionem* is of more value. After the Introduction explaining the purpose and importance of this document, its four decrees are dealt with in four articles: Afternoon Masses, The Eucharistic Fast for Priests and Laity, the Fast for Midnight Mass and Communion, the Fast for the Sick. The translation is satisfactory and the commentary adequate.

Three pages of bibliography and two of index complete this attractively set out and well printed volume.

P.F.M.

* * * * *

THE PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF MANILA OF 1771: With Commentary on Section "de Episcopis," by Rev. Pedro N. Bantigue, J.C.L. Catholic University of America Press, 260 pp., price 2 dollars.

Here we have the text of the first Provincial Council of Manila, and a dissertation submitted by Father Bantigue to

obtain his Doctorate in Canon Law. The text of the Acts of the Council is given in Latin, and documents and part of the Code of Civil Law dealing with the Indies are given in the original Spanish. Historical notes and the dissertation are in English. This first Manila Council was held by order of Charles III of Spain, who issued the order in virtue of his authority under "THE ROYAL PATRONAGE OF THE INDIES." This "ROYAL PATRONAGE" was an extraordinary privilege granted by the Roman Pontiffs to the Spanish kings to reward their zeal and encourage them to establish the Church in the Indies. It implied a certain intervention in the government and administration of the Church. The Acts and Decrees of the 1771 Council subsequently failed to receive approbation of the king, or recognition from the Holy See, and so the Decrees never obtained the force of law. They throw light, however, on the Spanish administration of the Church in the Philippines.

The declared aim of Spanish rule was principally missionary —the propagation of the Faith. Father Bantigue, a Filipino himself, pays tribute to the Spanish colonial government. "The fact that before Spain embarked on her career of colonization she had developed laws and institutions at home which were suited to the solution of colonial problems, and that she had no more to do than to inaugurate them in the colonies, certainly enabled Spain to put into operation in a short time a more finished and successful scheme of government than did any colonizing nation in any other part of the world." The LAWS OF THE INDIES, that is, the Code governing Spain's administration in the Indies, expressly provided that the colonies were to be administered, not for any political grandeur of the monarch or for the economic enrichment of the colonizers, but for the spiritual and cultural welfare of the natives. The term "Indies" applied to Central and South America as well as to the East Indies, the West Indies and the Philippines. The fact that to-day all of these territories administered or colonized by Spain have achieved political independence and are Catholic countries gives an indication that the declared aim of the Spanish rulers was in the main accomplished. Still, under a monarch like Charles III, prone to absolutism, the power of the king to intervene in Church matters had its decided disadvantages. Not only did orders to convoke the Council come from the King of Spain, but also the matters which were to be treated were outlined by him. The Council was convened by the Archbishop of Manila, and attended by the Bishops of the three suffragan Sees then in existence in the Philippines. There were six sessions, held in May, August, September, October and November of 1771. Not all the suffragan bishops signed the Decrees. One had been expelled before the proceedings finished, and another had walked out. Generally speaking, the matters treated in the Council were not greatly different from the matter of Councils to-day. It is interesting to note that, in the "Royal Document" authorizing the Council,

the King of Spain pointed out that buildings vacated by the recently suppressed Jesuit Order were to be turned into seminaries, and the seminaries were to be staffed by secular priests. Only by way of exception, and for a short time, could seminaries be staffed by religious. Actually, it is only now, after almost 200 years, that the secular clergy are staffing seminaries. A number of the Dioceses at present have Minor Seminaries staffed by seculars. All the Major Seminaries are still staffed by religious.

The lot of a bishop in the Philippines during the Spanish regime, made difficult by the conflicts that arose from the intervention of the State in Church affairs, was further aggravated by conflicts with exempt religious. These staffed most of the parishes, and claimed that their parishes were exempt from Episcopal visitation. Father Bantigue's comments throw light on these conflicts. It is interesting to note the role played by laymen, not in the field of the apostolate, but in the field which we to-day would consider far more parlous. In each parish two laymen were designated "Public Witnesses." These Public Witnesses were interrogated regularly by their Vicar Forane, and it was their duty to give an account of any irregularity in the conduct of the parish or in the conduct of the parish priest.

For the student of history, or even for the priest fond of serious browsing, this book is enjoyable and instructive.

F.C.

* * * * *

ELIZABETHAN QUINTET. By Denis Meadows. 304 pages. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1956. Price in Australia, 18/9.

Elizabethan Quintet is an account of five persons who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I and achieved some fame: Sir Francis Walsingham, Robert Persons, S.J., John Dee, Mary Frith, and Sir John Harington. Mr. Meadows makes no claim of research or originality, but he assembles the material that is to hand and writes easily and pleasantly about the five.

He is least successful with the first two figures. They have already been so much written about: and both the great events they played a part in and the complications of their characters are unsuitable subjects for his pen.

He is happier wandering through the curious career of the Queen's Astrologer, Dr. John Dee. Astronomy, astrology, magic, alchemy, and spiritualism were the learned man's chief interests, but he dabbled in all forms of erudition, and was capable even of devising welfare schemes to relieve unemployment. Like many spiritualists he was taken in by a plausible rogue claiming to be a medium; and there is an almost incredible account of six years' travel through Europe made at the medium's command by the Doctor's household, and under the guidance of the medium's controlling spirits—the archangel Gabriel and a teenage girl

named Madimi, who had an irritating habit of speaking Greek, and finally induced Dr. Dee and his medium to exchange wives.

Mary Frith, the Roaring Girl, is another whose life had enough of the bizarre to attract Mr. Meadows' attention and give his narrative interest. She was first a highwaywoman, and then a receiver of stolen goods. Her only trouble with the law, however, came from her habit of wearing breeches. She was tried in an ecclesiastical court, and sentenced to public penance at Paul's Cross—to stand in a long white robe and be preached at by a specially chosen clergyman.

The poet, Sir John Harington, had no career to match these in colour or fantasy; but its very incoherence, its sequence of unsuccessful efforts to make enough money to live in the style he regarded as due to himself, suits the author's loosely constructed sketches.

It is a treatment that brings out many curious and interesting facts from contemporary life and politics and religion, and it is these that make the book a rather interesting one. Mr. Meadows' fondness for seeing parallels between the ages of Elizabeth I and Elizabeth II leads to an irritating emphasis on the obvious; and there is an uncertainty about his use of colloquialisms and slang which at times produces bathos instead of vividness.

V.M.

* * * * *

OUR LADY OF LOURDES, by Monsignor Joseph Deery. Browne and Nolan, Dublin, 1958. XII + 266 pp. Illust. 18/-.

Monsignor Deery has written a magnificent book for the centenary of Lourdes. For over thirty years he has made annual visits to the shrine, interesting himself in the history of the town, the setting for the events of 1858. He writes with the moderation born of great knowledge of his subject. He begins with a description of Lourdes, "A rose on Mary's foot," as Maurice Barres said; then with great detail he tells the story of the Soubirous family, the apparitions and the action of the authorities. The author treats of the fruits of the apparitions: Sanctity (the life of St. Bernadette in the convent of Nevers), the growth of Lourdes as a Marian domain, and the miraculous cures. Monsignor Deery then brings out the significance of Lourdes in the century 1858-1958. Moreover he gives a selected list of books for those who wish to make a more detailed study. A feature of the book is the abundance of illustrations of the town, the grotto, the saint and her friends, the authorities, the basilica, the extraordinary new underground Church of St. Pius X, and the life of the pilgrims. There is such wealth that one feels Maurice Utrillo's fine painting of the basilica could have been included.

Monsignor Deery designed the book to satisfy not only the pilgrim but the thousands who will never be able to see Lourdes for themselves. All the reviewer can say is that it is the most

satisfying book on Lourdes that has come his way, reducing somewhat his envy of those who were fortunate enough to visit Lourdes in the year of grace, 1958.

—T.V.

* * * * *

THE BEDA BOOK, Sands and Co., London. English price 16/-.

The purchase of this book is a good work, as the proceeds of sales go to the cost of furnishing and decorating the new Beda building at Rome near the Porta San Paolo. This new building is the latest development in the history of an institution which has done splendid service to Catholicism in England and elsewhere.

The Beda College is a unique type of seminary, which celebrated its centenary in 1952. The date will at once suggest the days of the Oxford conversion, and the first purpose of the Beda was to train convert clergymen for the Catholic priesthood. Later it became the training ground of unusually late vocations, for whom discipline had to be more elastic and the course of studies shorter.

You may find an ex-anything studying at the Beda. I remember one year that they considered they had reached the record of housing an ex-everything, but had to admit regretfully that they had no ex-jockey.

The reader of "The Beda Book" must realise that he ought to expect the unequalness of an anthology. The volume contains no less than 50 essays or papers gathered from the back numbers of a quarter-century of the "Beda Review." Some are quite amateurish, and the historical articles have a fair crop of inaccuracies.

Nevertheless—we repeat—the variety will hold even a fastidiously critical reader, and he will find some charming pages—those for instance in which the present admirable Rector of the Beda, Monsignor Duchemin, tells what the Beda is, tells also the story of a remarkable convert who entered the Beda in 1855, and writes delightfully a concluding sketch entitled "Going on." Fortunately the volume includes an enthusiastic appreciation by a certain "Viator" of Monsignor Duchemin himself.

The contributors are numerous. Amongst them are Sir John O'Connell, Seldon P. Delany, Arnold Lunn (not of course a Beda man), Monsignor Gordon Wheeler, Vernon Johnson. Three papers by Charles Runge are particularly good.

"The Beda Book" has eight sections, on the College, on Historical Subjects, Roman Scenes, Impressions at St. Peter's, Italian Scenes, Roads to Rome, four papers on St. Bede, and six papers entitled General. Buy it and read it.

—W.L.